THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

MAY BE LOANED
After

VOL. XXXIV, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1927

The Passion of the Cross — Clifford Harley — 385

Authentic Evidence for Swedenborg's Psychical Experiences — John Whitehead — 399

Some Testimonies to the Greatness of Swedenborg (II) With Notes and Comments — Lewis F. Hite — 413

Spiritual Sight — John H. Ball — 437

"Mind and Personality" [A Review] — Lewis F. Hite — 441

MAY BE LOANED
After

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The New Age and the New Church LEWIS F. HITE - - - 464
Science and Religion WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - 474

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

Spiritual Captivity HORACE W. BRIGGS - - - - - - 482

Current Literature :

Helen Keller's "My Religion" WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - 497
Rev. Edward S. Kick's "The Modern Religious Situation" H. CLINTON HAY - - - - - - - - - - 499
Sadhu Sundar Singh's "Visions of the Spiritual World" JOHN WHITEHEAD - - - - - - - - - - 501
E. Stanley Jones' "The Christ of the Indian Road" JOHN DABOLL - - - - - - - - - - - 503
Edward S. Drown's "Religion or God?" B. A. WHITTEMORE - 504
Harry Emerson Fosdick's "Spiritual Values and Eternal Life" B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - 506
"Religion and Modern Life" (a Symposium) B. A. WHITTEMORE 506
James A. Montgomery's "The Book of Daniel" WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - - - 508
Thomas L. Masson's "The City of Perfection" H. CLINTON HAY 511

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXIV.] OCTOBER, 1927 [No. 4

THE PASSION OF THE CROSS.

BY THE REV. CLIFFORD HARLEY
of Manchester, England.

IT would appear from many signs that no small part of the intellectual unrest of our age in respect of the Christian religion, arises from the intimate connection of that religion with history. Christian theology arises from the various efforts made by men to interpret certain alleged happenings which occurred on our earth nearly two thousand years ago.

Christian theology has this in common with physical science: that it represents a system of thought that attempts the task of the interpretation of phenomena which have occurred on the plane of time and sense.

If the historic facts of Christianity should ever be proved to be untrue, the theology of Christianity could not survive for a single day. So clearly is this perceived that the opponents of the Christian religion from the beginning have set themselves the task not of merely ridiculing its theology, but of trying to invalidate the history upon which it is founded. And there have not been wanting, from the first century to our own era, those who have sought to defend Christianity by dissolving the alliance between the Gospel and history. They would have us believe that Jesus Christ was an idealized creation, not an historic person,

and that in the realm of ideas Christianity would still remain true, even though there were no historical Jesus.

But freedom from the admittedly difficult problems raised by the dependence of Christian theology upon certain alleged historical facts, may be bought at a dear price. A Christian religion distinguished from the Gospel facts has ceased to be Christianity in any real sense of the term.

There have been and are other great religions in which ideas play the chief, if not the only, part in their formulation and acceptance; religions which have been quite independent of their founders, except in so far as they rested upon the systems which they taught and bequeathed to mankind. Such, for instance, are the religions of Buddha, Zoroaster, of Mrs. Eddy. The truth or error of the ideas they taught is independent of the particular person who taught them. They would have been true or false, whoever had taught them; and they in no sense any longer depend upon their reputed originators.

Not so is it with Christianity. It stands or falls not by the truth of its *ideas* merely, but even more by the truth of its main historical facts; not indeed by all the facts recorded in the Gospels, which may be important in themselves, but are not historically vital to the truth of Christianity. But vital to its truth in the realm of ideas as well as history are the Gospel facts of the Incarnation of God in the flesh, and the work which He did, culminating in His death and His resurrection.

Of these historical facts we are chiefly concerned here with the crucifixion. Was Jesus Christ really crucified as the Gospel stories allege? That is our first enquiry. And the second: If so, what is the significance of the passion of the cross?

It is certain that we owe the story of the crucifixion to Jews. And it is equally certain that by Jewish instigation Jesus was put to death. It was by Jewish disciples that the story of the crucifixion was recorded; and the

Jesus who was crucified was as to the flesh born of and into the Jewish race.

It was indeed his claim to be their promised Messiah that constituted the focal point of the hostility of their leaders towards him; as it was the means whereby they secured the assistance of the Roman authorities to pronounce and carry out a sentence which it was not in their own power to perform. The leaders of the Jews conceived of the Messiah in political rather than in moral terms, and it was as a political menace that the Roman authorities condemned him to death.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to overestimate the part which the Messianic hopes of the Jews played in that supreme tragedy. It is conceivable that a Jew who verily believed that Jesus was the promised Messiah might have invented the story of his *death.* The idea of a suffering Messiah was not unfamiliar to them, as the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah witnesses; and such a story might be invented to fit in with that conception.

But while it is conceivable that a Jew might have invented the story of his *death,* it is not conceivable that any Jew who believed in his Messiahship could have concocted the story that he died by *crucifixion;* for such a mode of death involved its victim in the curse of the Law. "Cursed be everyone that dieth upon a tree" (Deuteronomy 21:23). For a Jew who believed in Jesus as Messiah to have invented the story of a crucified and therefore accursed Messiah, thus placing an insuperable and quite gratuitous obstacle in the path of any devout Jews whom he invited to share his faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, is utterly inconceivable and incredible.

Not less so is it, if he would recommend the Gospel to the Gentile world, to whom the cross was a death of infamy, the characteristic punishment of slaves. No analysis of the position involved is more searching or psychologically true than that to be found in the statement of St. Paul.

But we preach Christ, and Him crucified. To the Jews a stumb-

ling block; to the Greeks foolishness. But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God. (1 Cor. I, 23:4.)

Only one explanation can be given for this abnormal development of the Messianic hopes of Israel; namely, that death by crucifixion had overtaken one whom his followers regarded as Messiah, and whom, in spite of it, they persisted in regarding as Messiah.

To those who believe Christ to have been a myth, the story of his birth and death to be a development or adaptation of the Egyptian Osiris myth, I would commend these words of Dr. Frazer in his book "Adonis, Attis, Osiris":

The historical reality . . . of Christ has sometimes been doubted or denied. It would be just as reasonable to question the historical existence of Alexander the Great, or Charlemagne, on account of the legends which have gathered round them. The great religious movements which have stirred humanity to its depths and altered the beliefs of nations, sprang ultimately from the conscious and deliberate efforts of extraordinary minds, not from the blind unconscious cooperation of the multitude. The attempt to explain history without the influence of great men may flatter the vanity of the vulgar, but it will find no favor with the philosophic historian.

But the bare fact that Jesus was crucified means little or nothing to us, unless we understand something of the significance and bring ourselves into alignment and relation with it. It is one thing to be able to point to the national and personal occasions which led up to and encompassed that great tragedy. It is another thing to know what significance the crucifixion held for Jesus Himself; why He permitted Himself to be crucified, and what part the crucifixion played in the mission of His life.

That he foresaw his death is clear from the Gospel narratives.

The Son of Man must go up to Jerusalem and be crucified and the third day He will rise again.

The Son of Man is come to give His life a ransom for many.

He attached a deep significance to His death. "I, if I

be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." His disciples in all ages have likewise done so. The passion of the cross has been ever the center of Christian thoughts and hopes. Round it have been woven the strongest tendrils of human tenderness and devotion, of holiest love and self-sacrifice. Mankind have seen in it their liberation from intolerable burdens and drawn from it the ground of their deepest hopes and highest longings.

> Scarcely for a righteous man will one dare to die; . . . but God commendeth His love towards us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

That is one of the easiest and most characteristic formulations of the thoughts that the crucifixion raised in the mind of the greatest of the apostles. Also this: "He loved me, and gave Himself for me."

If, as the Gospel accounts make evident, Jesus foresaw and accepted the passion of the cross, we are constrained to ask: Did He die needlessly, in a tragic excess of suffering, or did He die of moral necessity? Was His death in some way necessary to the fulfilment of His mission? If so, what was the nature of that necessity, and did the event accomplish its purpose?

It is out of such questions as these that all our theories of atonement have arisen. Through the centuries men have recognized that the death on the cross was in some way necessary to the salvation of the world; and we of the New Church, not less than our brethren of other communions, have a definite contribution to make to Christian thought upon the subject.

It is my purpose now, as briefly as possible, to set forth at least the more important of the historic theories offered in answer to the question, What did the passion of the cross accomplish? In so doing it is needful that some criticism of the theories which have been advanced should be offered. But let it be understood that such criticism is made, not disdainfully, but with full acknowledgment of

the fact, that every sincere effort to understand the meaning of the passion of the cross has contributed something helpful to the thought and life of mankind, and with the desire to bring out the truth in the theories cited, and to amplify it from the truths revealed in this day of the Lord's Second Advent.

Let us enquire first of the Scriptures as to what they have to tell us of the need for the coming of Christ in the flesh?

The Scriptures plainly teach that there has been a fall in the moral and spiritual life of the human race, from the earliest state, and that the fall essentially consisted in man's ceasing to be willing to be led by the Lord, and his desiring to be led of himself. This fall is seen to be progressive in the sense that it more and more tended in the direction of externalism of thought and sensuality of life. This down-grade movement is described in the word by all manner of vivid symbolisms, and also by direct statement. The original state of the human race is pictured for us, in the symbolic story of the Garden of Eden, as being one of innocence, of childlike innocence, the innocence of ignorance. In the assertion of man's selfhood as against the Divine guidance, mankind first learned what evil is. *First* learned it, alike as a time fact but also as a spiritual reality, for until then it had no existence. It did not exist, "unknown," awaiting man's discovery. It came into existence through and from man's own desire to be led of himself, and it resulted, after many generations, in the inundating of the human race by evils of life and false persuasions, a calamity which is represented in the story of the flood.

At that point the history of the race had, as it were, a fresh beginning. The nature of the Divine intervention at that period of its history forms no part of my purpose to discuss here. The Scriptures represent the fact of Divine intervention under the figure of an ark which Noah was instructed by God to build for the saving of his house and the perpetuation of the race. There followed the call

of Abraham; the birth of the Jewish nation; the establishment of the Jewish Church; and the age of the prophets. The history of that long pilgrimage is the history of an increasing alienation of mankind from God,—a history of spasmodic recoveries from continuous lapses, and with persistent efforts on the part of God to recall and renew His people. Profane history, no less than sacred history, tells a similarly dreary story of tragedy.

> Behold darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people. Your iniquities have separated between you and your God. Hearken unto me O House of Israel. . . . Have I any pleasure at all in the death of the wicked? . . . Turn yourselves, live ye.

Throughout that period, nation after nation, civilization upon civilization had arisen, and reigned, and gone down in ruins. The glory of Judaism had likewise sunk into the disgrace of legalism, formalism and Phariseeism, whilst "the beauty that was Greece" had all but vanished and "the glory that was Rome" was rapidly approaching its eclipse.

Evil and sin were doing for all nations what neither the hostility of earthly powers nor the wonderful discoveries that still lay hidden in the womb of the future could have done. They were destroying the moral fibre and spiritual integrity of the race. Grosser and more gross, sensual to the last degree in thought and feeling no less than in deed, had the human race become.

> [They had indeed] blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts, that they should not see with their eyes, nor hear with their ears, nor understand with their hearts, and be converted, and I should heal them.

According to the Scriptures, it was then that there was made the supreme intervention of God. He became incarnate in the flesh, making a bodily revelation to a corporeal and sensual race, a revelation in time and space of the unceasing love of God for man.

And there they crucified Him! The apotheosis of sin.

Such is the story presented by the Scriptures. Alienation from God by man; demanding as its remedy "atonement."

What was the atonement, and how was it effected? What part did the passion of the cross play in the work of atonement? What answer to this question do the Gospels give?

Let it be said at once that they formulate no systematic doctrine. They relate simply the coming of Jesus "to save His people from their sins," His deeds of mercy and His words of grace, His crucifixion at the hands of men, His triumph over death, and His resurrection. The very word "atonement" is unknown to the Gospels, although it was natural enough that Jewish disciples, with their ideas of making atonement for sin, by the sacrifice of lambs and bullocks and he-goats, should have transferred the idea to Christ, in whom they saw the symbolical "Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." The essential idea herein is a true one, if it be remembered that the Jewish sacrifices were themselves symbolical. In the lambs and bullocks and the goats were seen types and shadows of natural and spiritual human affections, which, dedicated, consecrated, "sacrificed," to the rule of God's commandments, made atonement (at-one-ment) again possible between the alienated heart of man and the unutterable love of God. But it is an untrue idea, if it be thought that the Jewish sacrifices of animals could in themselves make clean the heart of the sinner on whose behalf they were offered; or if it be thought that in like manner the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was an offering that automatically and mechanically secured the pardon and the salvation of man. The fact is that He too made atonement for sin by doing actually what the Jewish sacrifices only typified; dedicating, hallowing, consecrating those very affections and thoughts, desires and feelings, in His own human nature, to the purposes for which mankind is endowed with them. In His own person, in His own humanity, He reconciled the human with the Divine. In His own person,

the human and the Divine were made of "one mind: atonement."

But was this true idea one which was generally held? Until the conversion of Paul to Christianity there was no formulation of a doctrine of atonement; he formulated not one doctrine, but several; and these in terms of ideas borrowed from the Jewish and pagan systems of his day. Propitiation, expiation, atonement are terms which he often used to express his varying ideas on the nature of Christ's work. The first two are entirely pagan. They have neither source nor parallel in the Old Testament Scriptures. The third term, "atonement," means reconciliation.

Of all his many-sided conceptions, reconciliation is the most helpful of Paul's contributions to our thought of the work of Christ; and in one single instance Paul has stated the true doctrine of the work of our Lord, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself." It is a pity that thought was not always central in the apostle's mind. Instead he dallied with the idea of substitution. Christ died "in our stead." He also stressed the idea of "ransom" (an idea clearly derived from the social conditions of his day, when men were led into slavery, from which they might be ransomed by a sufficient payment) as if God had led men into captivity, and needed either purchase money or the body of a living person to redeem them.

It is difficult to know what Paul really did think, when he spoke of Christ as a ransom. From whom did He ransom mankind? From God? If not, from whom? Paul never answers this question. The theology of the Eastern Church, however, represents it to have been a ransom from the devil, who, it was believed, had led mankind into captivity, and to whom the ransom must be paid. The purchase price, according to this theology, was the body of Christ, the Son of God, paid by his death on the cross.

But was the devil really paid off by this transaction, or was he cheated in the end (for resurrection followed the

crucifixion)? That seems to have been the idea held by many. The theological text-books of the mediæval church continuously use the image of "a mouse-trap baited with blood" to illustrate how the devil was trapped and cheated. Such seems to have been the idea of atonement held by St. Augustine, Peter the Lombard, Hildebert of Tours, Bonaventura; and it even survives in the theology of the Roman Church in the writings of the scholastic philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas.

Gross? Undignified and unearthly? Yes! but yet, not without some element of truth. Whatever the real motive of the atonement was, it certainly did involve *the defeat of Hell*—and this is the kernel of the ransom theory of the Eastern and mediæval Churches.

Other ideas of atonement are as common to Protestant theology as to Roman or Greek theology; *e.g.*, the ideas involved in such terms as "satisfaction," "merit," "justice." We owe the doctrine of satisfaction, imposed upon the Protestant no less than the Catholic Church, to Anselm, who was a lawyer. It is a term and an idea borrowed from Roman jurisprudence. The doctrine briefly set forth is that the honor of God demanded that satisfaction should be made, for the dishonoring of His law by sinful men; and the satisfaction is conceived to consist in the death of the sinner. But in His love and pity for man, God would accept, as full satisfaction to His honor, the death of His own Son,—the sinless and spotless Lamb of God,—and transfer the merit of His death to the believer.

The doctrine of satisfaction and merit has received a characteristic development in Roman Catholic theology and practice. The righteousness of Christ was deemed to be merit enough; but His sacrificial death was an "overplus" of merit, beyond what was actually needed; and this overplus could be drawn upon by the believer who was qualified by the "works" of penance and the mass.

The idea was extended likewise to the saints, who also had an "overplus" of merit. Christ having all merit, and

more than sufficient, there remained but the need for men's observance of the sacraments of the Church. Anything above and beyond that is likewise an overplus of merit; and the saints are those who have laid up to themselves an overplus of merit which is available for the needs of the believer.

Here again an element of truth underlies the extravagance of the doctrine of satisfaction and merit. The truth is, that the honor of God is only satisfied with the salvation of man. To effect redemption and make possible salvation, was the very work of our Lord; and the strength whereby He accomplished it is always at man's disposal. Merit cannot be transferred. But strength and power may be imparted, at same time imparting their only merit to his works.

I might spend much time relating and discussing historic theories of atonement, but we should find that one and all were largely vitiated by a cardinal misconception. That misconception is, that God and Christ are not one, but two persons. So that, whatever element of truth may lie in the many and various attempts that have been made through the centuries to understand the nature of atonement, they are vitiated by that fundamental misconception. Let us then look at the New-Church doctrine of atonement in the light of the fundamental truth that God is one, in essence and person, and the Lord Jesus Christ is that God. Moreover, let us recall the Biblical doctrine universally accepted by the Church that sin had interposed between man and God, and that it was from sin that he needed to be redeemed.

These truths are our data. Is there any interpretation which will fit the facts, neither explaining them away nor exalting any of them out of due proportion? I offer the doctrine of the New Church as a sufficient answer.

"They shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."

What is *sin?*

We may define sin as the deliberate and therefore conscious perversion and misuse of the powers and faculties of human nature. Their true use is disclosed in the Divine Commandments. The effect of this misuse and perversion is to twist—even to close up—the interiors of the mind against the Divine, and so, to pervert and vitiate the life that man receives by influx from the Lord. Thus, Swedenborg writes:

> To sin is to do and to think what is evil and false intentionally and from the will. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8925.)
>
> What comes into thought, but not into will, is not sin. If it enters the will . . . and he thinks that it is a sin . . . and it is therefore shaken off, this cannot be sin, but temptation. Whereas if anything comes into thought and into will so that he desires to effect it provided external bonds were removed: this is sin. (Spiritual Diary, n. 3178.)

Concerning its effect, he says:

> Everyone who commits actual sin thereby induces a nature upon himself; the evil therefore is implanted in his children. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 313.)

Now this precisely is the condition of men, exhibited in the Biblical narratives. An evil nature had been induced upon man in general, as well as upon particular men. The heredity of man had thus become almost entirely evil. In each generation the latent capacity became the external act, thus strengthening the induced evil nature, which reached its climax in the fearful internal state of mankind at the time when our Lord became incarnate. Mankind has no power to throw off the nature they had induced upon themselves.

> I looked and there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercession; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me, and my righteousness sustained me.

The incarnation was necessary in order that the Divine power of Goodness and Truth might reach men *externally* (they having closed up the *interiors* of the mind with evils

and falsities, so that it was perverted in its descent into them); and also and more that in a human nature within which were all the hereditary tendencies to evil which afflicted the human race, the Divine might come into direct contact with the hells, from whence those evils emanated; and by being tempted as mankind were tempted might oppose to them the resources of Infinite Love and Truth, and overcoming them, might, as it were, loose their strangle hold upon the neck of humanity and hold them in eternal subjection. This infirm human nature God took upon himself by birth of a virgin mother (the only conceivable mode of incarnation), He Himself indwelling in that infirm humanity as its very soul and life. In the maternal humanity He admitted temptations—more direful, more hellish than anything we can know or imagine. In it were concentrated the hereditary evil tendencies of the whole human race; and through them the hells fought against Him. But, although He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet He was without sin. Where man was tempted only to fall, He was tempted and overcame. Throughout His life temptations continued. Throughout His life he waged incessant conflict with them. "How am I straightened until it be accomplished?" He cried. As the temptations were successively overcome, they increased in severity and power; but also as they were successively overcome, so the infirm humanity was put off, and the Divine inflowed ever more fully into the human, subduing it to itself. The passion of the cross was the last and most desperate of these temptations. What was its nature? Who can know? All we know is, that it wrung from the Lord the awful cry of one utterly forsaken and alone, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Then there was a silence; and then a cry: "It is finished!" The temptation was resisted. Hell was conquered, and men were free. The temptation on the cross which marked the finished work of redemption, also marked the completion of the glorification of the humanity. Hell tried to kill his soul and

failed. Hell tried to destroy his body and succeeded. Succeeded in what? In removing the last vestige or trace of the infirm humanity assumed in time, making possible the full and complete descent of the Divine into the human. Thus in Him was the atonement. In His Divine humanity was the human reconciled with the Divine.

Would not any other means of death have done as well? Doubtless it would. But in accepting a death so grievous, so shameful, so abhorred and abhorrent, He surely commended His love toward us,—the external testification to the truth, "In His love and in His pity he redeemed us."

The work of redemption is thus seen to be the unaided work of the Lord. "Redemption was a work purely Divine," says Swedenborg. It was God's own work of releasing mankind from hell's strangle hold upon our spiritual freedom. It was truly a supernatural work; but in no sense was it "magical," nor does anything magical attach to the significance of the passion.

It did not release man from one iota of his responsibility for working out his own salvation. On the contrary, it restored the responsibility lost by the slavery to sin into which he had fallen. It is as imperative now as it was before, that, if we would enter into life we must keep the Commandments, and this, by our cooperation with the Lord, and by laying hold on His strength.

Redemption, as thus conceived, is honoring to the nature of God and inspiring to the soul of man. With greater reason than any other, the New-Churchman can sing,

When I survey the wondrous cross,
  On which the prince of glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
  And pour contempt on all my pride.

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
  That were an offering far too small,
Love so amazing, so divine,
  Demands my love, my life, my all.

CLIFFORD HARLEY.

AUTHENTIC EVIDENCE FOR SWEDENBORG'S PSYCHICAL EXPERIENCES.

By the Rev. John Whitehead.

A GREAT FIRE took place in Stockholm on July 19, 1759, which destroyed a large part of the southern suburb in which Swedenborg's house and garden were situated. The fact and the date are given in a number of quotations in the "Documents Concerning Swedenborg," gathered by Rudolph L. Tafel, Ph.D. (London: The Swedenborg Society, 1875-77, 3 vols.) Swedenborg described the fire during its occurrence while in Gottenburg three hundred miles distant.

M. de Marteville, Dutch Ambassador to Sweden, died April 25, 1760. Some time before his death he bought an expensive silver set from a silversmith in Stockholm, who subsequently presented a bill to the widow. She felt certain that her husband had paid the bill, but could not find the receipt. She was advised to ask Swedenborg to consult her husband in the spiritual world, which she did; and Swedenborg subsequently told her where the receipt was.

Some time in the latter part of 1761, Swedenborg was invited to attend court, and was there asked by the Queen of Sweden, Louisa Ulrica, to give her some proof of his communication with the spiritual world. He returned a few days afterward, and told her of some facts concerning herself and her late brother, the Crown Prince, Adolphus Frederick of Prussia. The Queen was much agitated at the message, and declared that no one but herself and her brother now deceased knew of the facts communicated by Swedenborg.

These three experiences occurred 1759 to 1761. They

soon became widely known and discussed in the higher circles of society, not only in Sweden but in many parts of Europe. It may be observed that Swedenborg had wide acquaintance with learned and educated men throughout Europe; and he was also a member of the Swedish House of Nobles, and moved in the very highest circles of society. This accounts for the testimony establishing the truth of these events, as coming from men and women of honor and solid reputation.

Let us consider in some detail the testimony of others as to the actuality of these occurrences: first, the fire in Stockholm.

What is the evidence proving that Swedenborg saw, described, and announced the fire and its progress? He was at Gottenburg three hundred miles from Stockholm. This was before the age of telegraph, telephone and radio, and in an age of materialistic thought. Let us transfer our minds back one hundred and seventy years. If people are now skeptical as to psychic experiences, how much more so in that age, when every narrative of such experiences was relegated to the realm of superstition and of fraud. Swedenborg was met by that spirit in his own time, and has been ever since. The world is only now awaking to the realization of his supreme importance in this field of human knowledge.

The report of these three remarkable experiences soon reached the ears of the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, who discusses them in his "Dreams of a Spirit Seer," published in 1766. This book excited the curiosity of Madam von Knobloch, who wrote to Kant asking him about the facts. Kant replied to this letter on August 10, 1768.

Kant had a friend, an Englishman, named Green who was going to Stockholm. He commissioned him "to make particular inquiries respecting the miraculous gift which Swedenborg possesses." "Kant made the acquaintance of his friend Green during the summer of 1767; Green saw Swedenborg early in 1768, and returned to Konigsberg in

time to meet Kant on Whit-Monday, 1768." Green was a highly educated English gentleman who became an intimate friend of Kant, and it is to him that Kant owed his direct knowledge of the facts concerning Swedenborg. These facts he communicated to Madam von Knobloch. He wrote her as follows concerning the Stockholm fire:

The following occurrence appears to me to have the greatest weight of proof, and to place the assertion respecting Swedenborg's extraordinary gift beyond all possibility of doubt. In the year 1759 [the German original has 1756] toward the end of September [July], on Saturday at four o'clock P.M., Swedenborg arrived at Gottenburg from England, when Mr. William Castel invited him to his house, together with a party of fifteen persons. About six o'clock, Swedenborg went out, and returned to the company quite pale and alarmed. He said that a dangerous fire had just broken out in Stockholm, at the Sodermalm [Gottenburg is about 50 German miles, or 300 English miles, from Stockholm], and that it was spreading very fast. He was restless, and went out often. He said that the house of one of his friends, whom he named, was already in ashes, and that his own was in danger At eight o'clock, after he had been out again, he joyfully exclaimed, "Thank God! the fire is extinguished, the third door from my house." This news occasioned great commotion throughout the whole city, but particularly amongst the company in which he was. It was announced to the governor the same evening. On Sunday morning Swedenborg was summoned to the governor, who questioned him concerning the disaster. Swedenborg described the fire precisely, how it had begun, and in what manner it had ceased, and how long it had continued. On the same day the news spread through the city; and as the governor had thought it worthy of attention, the consternation was considerably increased, because many were in trouble on account of their friends and property, which might have been involved in the disaster. On Monday evening a messenger arrived at Gottenburg, who had been dispatched by the Stockholm Board of Trade during the time of the fire. In the letters brought by him the fire was described precisely in the manner stated by Swedenborg. On Tuesday morning the royal courier arrived at the governor's, with the melancholy intelligence of the fire, of the loss which it had occasioned, of the houses it had damaged and ruined, not in the least differing from that which Swedenborg had given at the very time when it happened; for the fire was extinguished at eight

o'clock. (Documents concerning Swedenborg. Vol. II. pp. 628-629.)

Tafel remarks on this account:

This is the most minute account which we have of this occurrence; and as Kant's friend, the Englishman Green, according to Kant, "examined all, not only in Stockholm, but also in Gottenburg, where he was well acquainted with the most respectable houses, and where he could obtain the most authentic and complete information," we have full reason to place implicit reliance upon it. (Documents Concerning Swedenborg, Vol. II. p. 650.)

There are several other independent testimonies to this incident.

Swedenborg himself gave an account of it to Bergstrom, a resident of London, who reported it as follows:

Swedenborg also related the story of the fire at Stockholm, that after he had gone out from the company into the garden of the house at Gottenburg, he returned, and told the company soon after, that his house and garden were safe, and described how near the flames had come to it, though no account from thence had then arrived. (Documents, Vol. II, p. 631.)

Jung-Stilling in his "Theory of Pneumatology" narrates the story of the Stockholm fire, and says,

I consider it my duty to make known the *pure truth* respecting him, since I have had opportunity of knowing it pure and uncontaminated. . . . This story is certain and true.

Christopher Springer, one of Swedenborg's personal friends, a man very prominent in Swedish political affairs, and later residing in London and receiving important positions under the British Government, says of the fire:

I asked Swedenborg whether it was true, as I had been informed, that when he was at Gottenburg (a town about sixty Swedish miles from Stockholm), he had foretold to his friends, three days before the arrival of the post, the precise hour of the great fire that had happened in Stockholm; to which he replied that it was exactly true. (Documents, Vol. II, p. 630.)

There are several other accounts which give the general facts. Kant's account, derived through a personal repre-

sentative who went to Sweden and gathered the facts first hand, is the fullest and most satisfactory of all. In reviewing the evidence we think that it is fully proved that Swedenborg told of the Stockholm fire while it was still raging, he being three hundred English miles distant.

We will discuss the nature of this experience later.

With regard to the Dutch Ambassador's Lost Receipt, Kant in his letter to Madam von Knobloch gives the following statement, the facts having been communicated to him by Green:

Madam Marteville, the widow of the Dutch Ambassador in Stockholm, some time after the death of her husband was called upon by Croon, a goldsmith, to pay for a silver service which her husband had purchased from him. The widow was convinced that her late husband had been much too precise and orderly not to have paid this debt, yet she was unable to find the receipt. In her sorrow, and because the amount was considerable, she requested Mr. Swedenborg to call at her house. After apologizing to him for troubling him, she said, that if, as all people said, he possessed the extraordinary gift of conversing with the souls of the deceased, he would perhaps have the kindness to ask her husband how it was about the silver service. Swedenborg did not at all object to complying with her request. Three days afterward the said lady had company at her house for coffee. Swedenborg called, and in his cool way informed her that he had conversed with her husband. The debt had been paid seven months before his decease, and the receipt was in a bureau in the room upstairs. The lady replied that the bureau had been quite cleared out, and that the receipt was not found among all the papers. Swedenborg said that her husband had described to him how, after pulling out the left-hand drawer, a board would appear, which required to be drawn out, when a secret compartment would be disclosed, containing his private Dutch correspondence, as well as the receipt. Upon hearing this description the whole company arose and accompanied the lady into the room upstairs. The bureau was opened; they did as they were directed: the compartment was found, of which no one had ever known before; and, to the great astonishment of all, the papers were discovered there, in accordance with his description. (Document Vol. II, pp. 635-636.)

Quite a number of versions of this story exist, which

may be traced back to eleven different sources. Robsahm and Bergstrom heard the story from Swedenborg himself. As Green visited Swedenborg, no doubt Swedenborg confirmed the truth of it to Green himself. Letocard, who was Secretary to the legation and executor of Marteville's estate, gives an account very similar to that of Kant.

As the story passed from mouth to mouth, the particulars were modified in various ways; so that we find a number of accounts which vary as to the particulars, the central fact remaining practically the same. Kant's account seems again to be the clearest and most consistent.

The last incident that we are to consider here is that of the Queen of Sweden's Secret. The persons concerned in this experience are eminent in the world's history. Queen Louisa Ulrica was the sister of Frederick the Great of Prussia; her brother Augustus William, who is mentioned in the narrative, was the Crown Prince of Prussia, brother of the reigning King, Frederick the Great. From this brother were descended the monarchs of Prussia and the emperors of United Germany. The son of Adolphus succeeded Frederick the Great on the throne of Prussia. Augustus William had been declared heir-apparent of Prussia; but unfortunately for him, he lost the battle of Hastenbeck, July 26, 1757, which greatly displeased the King. Augustus was compelled to resign. He retired and died within a year, of "chagrin." It was with this brother that Queen Louisa had the secret.

Kant's account of this event is as follows:

> Toward the end of 1761, Mr. Swedenborg was called to a princess, whose great understanding and penetration ought to have made an attempt at imposition almost impossible. He was summoned to her on account of the general rumor which had reached her of his being the subject of visions. After asking him some questions, more for the purpose of deriving sport from his imagination than of obtaining information from the other world, the princess dismissed him, after having charged him first with a secret commission touching his intercourse with spirits. After a few days Mr. Swedenborg appeared again with a reply of such

a nature that, according to the princess, according to her own confession, she was greatly astonished; for his reply was true, and yet no living person could have given it to him. This narrative is derived from the report of an ambassador at the Swedish court, to another ambassador in Copenhagen; besides it agrees with what we were able to learn by special investigation. (Documents, Vol. II, pp. 653-654.)

General Tuxen, a Danish general, having heard these stories, sought an interview with Swedenborg. Tuxen says, "My first question was, Whether the relation, reported as having passed between himself and the Queen in Stockholm, was true?"

[Swedenborg then told Tuxen that, in accordance with the wish of the Queen, Count Scheffer had asked him to attend court.] The Queen asked him, Whether he would undertake a commission to her lately deceased brother? He answered, "With all my heart." On this he followed the Queen, with the King and Count Scheffer, to a window in the apartment, where the Queen gave him his commission, to which he promised to bring her an answer. . . . [Shortly afterward he accompanied Count Scheffer to court again.] The Queen on seeing him, said, "Do not forget my commission." He answered, "It is already done." And when he delivered her his message, she was extremely surprised, and became suddenly indisposed; and upon recovering herself, she said, "This no mortal could have told me." (Documents, Vol. II, pp. 651-652.)

Another account of this incident was given by Count Hopken, which he states was made to him by the Queen herself. He says:

At the next reception Swedenborg again appeared at court; and while the Queen was in the so-called white room, surrounded by her ladies of honor, he came boldly in, and approached Her Majesty, who no longer remembered the commission she had given him a week before. Swedenborg not only greeted her from her brother, but also gave her his (the brother's) apologies for not having answered her last letter; he also wished to do so now through Swedenborg; which he accordingly did. The Queen was greatly overcome, and said, "No one, except God, knows this secret." (Documents, Vol. II, p. 660.)

Several other sources of information concerning this

event are on record. Some of them were derived from Swedenborg; some are traced to the Queen; while others are traced to persons close to the Court. The Queen, on a visit to Berlin in 1772 several years later, in a conversation with several academicians gave an account of the affair, but did not tell what the secret was. Thiebault afterward published a long account, in which he says:

> The Queen did not repeat the words, but she protested to us they were the very same her brother had pronounced, and that she retained the most perfect recollection of them. She added that she nearly fainted at the shock she experienced. (Documents, Vol. II, p. 656.)

The Queen was not superstitious and easily duped. All agree that she was a highly intellectual woman. Her brother Frederick the Great declared her "to be the ornament of her family." She was of a masculine understanding, was remarkably eloquent, and had great force of character.

One distinguished chevalier, whose name is not given, telling of an interview he had with her in relation to her experience with Swedenborg, says:

> The Queen herself told me the anecdote respecting herself and her brother, with a conviction which appeared to me extraordinary. Everyone who was acquainted with this really enlightened sister of the great Frederick will agree with me that she was the very reverse of fanatical, and that the whole tenor of her mind was free from all such weaknesses. Nevertheless, she appeared to me to be so convinced of Swedenborg's supernatural intercourse with spirits, that I scarcely durst venture to intimate my doubts, and to express my suspicion of secret intrigues; and a royal air, *Je ne suis pas facilement dupe* (I am not easily duped), put an end to all my attempts at refutation.

Swedenborg himself has given testimony concerning this event. In a letter to Louis IX, Landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt, he says:

> As to what is related of the daughter of the Prince Margrave, it is a fiction invented by some idle news-monger, and I never

even heard of it before; but what is reported of the brother of the Queen of Sweden is true; yet it should not be regarded as a miracle, but only as a memorable occurrence of the kind related in the "True Christian Religion" concerning Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and the rest. For all these are simply testimonies, that I have been introduced by the Lord as to my spirit into the spiritual world, and that I converse with angels and spirits.

Cuno, a Dutch gentleman who frequently entertained Swedenborg when he was in Amsterdam, writing about the stories of the late Prince of Prussia and of the lost receipt, says:

The truth of both these stories he (Swedenborg) affirmed; but he did not dwell long upon them, observing that there were hundreds of similar stories. He did not think it worth while to waste many words upon them, saying that all these things were trifles placing in the shade the great object of his mission. (Documents-Vol. II, p. 648.)

Swedenborg in referring to these and other similar facts, speaks of them as proving his intercourse with the spiritual world. Christopher Springer writing of Swedenborg, with whom he had intimate friendship, says:

All that he has told me of my deceased friends and enemies, and of the secrets I had with them, is almost past belief. He even explained to me in what manner peace was concluded between Sweden and the King of Prussia; and he praised my conduct on that occasion. He even specified the three high personages whose services I made use of at that time; which was nevertheless, a profound secret. On asking him how it was possible for him to obtain such information, and who had discovered it to him, he replied, "Who informed me about your affair with Count Claes Ekeblad? You cannot deny that what I have told you is true. Continue," he added, "to merit his reproaches; depart not from the good way either for honors or money; but, on the contrary, continue as constant therein as you have hitherto, and you will prosper." (Documents, Vol. II, page 533.)

The Count had provoked him to draw his sword upon him, differing about politics, but they had made it up, and promised not to mention it to any one while in life; that afterward the Count had attempted to bribe him with 10,000 rix-dalers, which sum Swedenborg particularly mentioned to him as having been

learned from the Count just then deceased. (Documents, Vol. II, p. 534.)

Swedenborg refers to the Stockholm fire as evidence of his open intercourse with the spiritual world. Such gifts of seeing things at a distance are now called clairvoyance; but this term is used in widely different senses. In telling of the fire in Stockholm, Swedenborg described its progress and extinction, and told where it stopped. How can this be evidence of intercourse with the spiritual world? The fire was on the material plane. Swedenborg was also on the material plane three hundred miles distant. We know of no law of optics by which the fire could have been seen from Gottenburg. It was before the age of telegraphy, telephony, or radio. In all these methods of communication well known laws are operative, and the means of communication are all material. But in seeing distant objects and scenes as in this experience of Swedenborg's, no material laws are known which can explain the occurrence. It may be ascribed to telepathy, or thought transference. Henry Holt, in "Cosmic Relations," quotes the account from Kant, and remarks, "This may have been pure telepathy from the minds of witnesses in Stockholm, or it may have been telopsis (clairvoyance)." (Cosmic Relations, p. 229.) It is physically certain that the fire itself was not seen by any known or unknown method of material communication. How then could it be seen? In general, in such cases there is an intensification of thought and feeling acting on the mental states of those in great excitement. This is not a physical activity; it is mental, that is, spiritual. According to Swedenborg, thought and feeling are activities of man's spirit, not of his brain or body. The atmosphere of the spiritual world vibrate in correspondence with thought. All communications in the spiritual world are carried as vibrations in the atmospheres of that world, and are perceived there; the thought of one is carried to another by direct thought transference. It may be, and also is, carried by speech through another,

a lower, atmosphere of the spiritual plane, by vibrations therein; and is perceived by the spiritual hearing as sound. Since all minds are spiritual, and even before death are in the spiritual world and subject to its laws, they are subjects of this spiritual transfer of thought; but because most minds are conscious only in a lower degree, they are not conscious of the interior operations going on within them. But when one is opened to the perception of the spiritual plane, then all these operations are open to conscious perception. Given the situation described, the minds of the people in Stockholm were in an intensely excited state. Their thoughts and feelings were spiritually active, and a representation of the fire could be produced correspondingly in the spiritual world. Swedenborg was conscious in that spiritual world, and perceived the whole course of the event. Telepathy was concerned in his experience; but what is telepathy but the spiritual law of communication between mind and mind? But in that world there is more than thought communication; there is also visible representation, as is abundantly proved by the visions of the Bible, and by modern experiences.

The lost receipt is similar to the secret statements in the sealed envelopes, the contents of which are known only to writers who have departed this life. The Dutch Ambassador paid the bill, and put it in a secret drawer known only by himself. His widow believed that the bill had been paid, but was not certain from definite knowledge. Swedenborg and all the testimony ascribe the information to his intercourse with the Dutch Ambassador himself in the spiritual world. This cannot be a case of mind-reading, for although the silversmith knew the bill had been paid, he did not know where the receipt was. He had no knowledge of the secret drawer and its contents. This information could come from no other source than the mind of the ambassador. If death ends all, there would have been no mind in which the knowledge was preserved. The facts are well established. The conclusion is, that Swedenborg

derived his knowledge from intercourse with the Ambassador in the spiritual world. Henry Holt quotes this account from Kant, and says:

> This, if telepathy, apparently could have been only from the mind of Marteville surviving bodily death, though there is a faint probability that some living person knew it. The only remaining hypotheses are, that it was telopsis, or that we don't know.

As Podmore, and I dare say others, points out (Modern Spiritualism, Vol. I, p. 15):

> The idea of intercourse with distinctively human spirits, if not actually introduced by Swedenborg, at least established itself first in the popular consciousness through his teaching. . . . For him there was no gulf fixed between this earthly life and that which is believed to lie beyond death. The great principle of continuity is preserved. Nature makes no leap, even over the grave, and heaven and hell are seen in his prosaic pages to be much like Stockholm or London.
>
> [To this Holt adds:] Which latter fact is, with me at least, an argument *pro tanto* for the genuineness of his heaven at least. (Cosmic Relations, p. 230.)

The facts of the Queen of Sweden's relation with Swedenborg are established by a large mass of evidence. Kant was convinced of the truth of the affair. Numerous accounts of the experience have been found in letters, documents, and published papers. Several of these came directly to the authors from Swedenborg, or from the Queen. The facts are these. The secret, whatever it was, was known only to the Queen and her brother. How could Swedenborg know the facts? Swedenborg and the Queen affirmed that he got the information from her brother in the spiritual world. One explanation is that it was telepathy or mind-reading, and that Swedenborg derived his knowledge from the Queen's mind, not from that of her deceased brother. This may be possible, but not probable. The sincerity and veracity of Swedenborg cannot reasonably be doubted. There are too many testimonies to his honesty and truthfulness. Cuno in his long account of his relations with Swedenborg says: "When he gazed upon me with his smiling blue eyes, which he always did in con-

versing with me, it was as if truth itself was speaking from them." (Documents, Vol. II, p. 445.)

Two opposite ways are followed in discussing psychical phenomena. One way is either to deny them, or to ascribe them to some material operation,—which is essentially to deny them. Let the materialist show that a vibration of the material brain can give knowledge of a present event to a mind at the antipodes. The other way is to explain them by spiritual vibrations from mind to mind, *i.e.*, by supermaterial means; especially in view of the fact that in the spiritual world material laws do not operate, but spiritual laws. Minds far distant from each other in natural space may be in rapport spiritually, and on the spiritual plane thought from one may be transferred to another. Swedenborg gives us much information concerning the laws involved. All psychic phenomena operate according to these laws. But because they are above material laws, the materialist is skeptical in regard to them.

In closing I will mention a few other psychical experiences of a similar character connected with Swedenborg. Cuno narrates that it was published in the Dutch papers that the King of Portugal had caused the Bishop of Coimbra to be hung. Swedenborg said, "It is not true, the Bishop has not been hung, or else I should have known it." (Documents, Vol. II, p. 451.)

Jung-Stilling says a very dear friend writes him that

> In the year 1762, on the very day when the Emperor Peter of Russia died, Swedenborg was present with me at a party in Amsterdam. In the middle of the conversation, his physiognomy became changed, and it was evident that his soul was no longer present in him, and that something was taking place with him. As soon as he recovered, he was asked what had happened? At first he would not speak out, but being repeatedly urged, he said, "Now, at this very hour the Emperor Peter II has died in prison," explaining the nature of his death. "Gentlemen, will you please make a note of this day, in order that you may compare it with the announcement of his death, which will appear in the newspapers?" The papers soon after announced the death of the

Emperor, which had taken place on the very same day. (Documents, Vol. II, p. 490.)

John Wesley received a letter from Swedenborg dated in Feb., 1772, which read:

Great Bath-street, Coldbath Fields, February, 1772.

Sir:—I have been informed in the world of spirits that you have a strong desire to converse with me. I shall be happy to see you, if you will favor me with a visit. I am, sir,

Your humble servant,

Eman. Swedenborg.

Mr. Wesley received and read this letter in the presence of some of his preachers, one of whom, Rev. Samuel Smith, tells the story.

Mr. Wesley frankly acknowledged to the company that he had been very strongly impressed with the desire to see and converse with Swedenborg, and that he had never mentioned that desire to any one.

Mr. Wesley wrote for answer, that he was closely occupied in preparing for a six months' journey, but would do himself the pleasure of waiting upon Mr. Swedenborg soon after his return to London.

Swedenborg wrote in reply, that the visit proposed by Mr. Wesley would be too late, as he, Swedenborg, should go into the world of spirits on the 29th day of the next month, never more to return. (Documents, Vol. II, p. 565.)

Swedenborg died March 29, 1772.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

SOME TESTIMONIES TO THE GREATNESS OF SWEDENBORG (II).

With Notes and Comments by the Rev. Lewis F. Hite.

IN our last issue we printed the first of two instalments of testimonials concerning Swedenborg by others than those who knew him personally. In that issue we confined our attention to certain European celebrities. In this we shall set forth the views of certain noted Americans; first that of the late Hon. John Bigelow.

The Hon. John Bigelow (1817-1911) was at one time joint owner and editor of the New York *Evening Post,* then consul at Paris and afterwards United States Minister to France, Secretary of State for New York, editor of the complete Works of Franklin, etc. He was a versatile author of marked ability; and he has left a record of his studies and opinions of Swedenborg hardly surpassed by any other public man. Many of the opinions which distinguished men have left on record about Swedenborg are based on a very superficial acquaintance with his writings, but Mr. Bigelow's opinions are based on a serious and constant study from the prime of his life through a period of more than half a century. In "The Bible That Was Lost and Is Found" (first edition, privately printed for his family and friends, 1893,—second edition, New-Church Board of Publication, New York, 1912) he has left an autobiographical account of his reading of Swedenborg of rare testimonial value.

When seventy-one years of age, after a mature lifetime of study (thirty-four years), he published a little book of sixty-six pages, entitled "Emanuel Swedenborg, Servus Domini" (Putnam's, New York, 1888), in which he gave a popular account of Swedenborg's Life and Writings, and incidently his own opinions and estimate. From these

two books the following quotations are made: first, from this biography.

"Among the men who have been instrumental in contributing to the moral and spiritual progress of our kind, there is no one in any age who has claimed to have rendered a more important service than Emanuel Swedenborg . . . ; he claimed to have explored entirely new and unattempted regions of truth, to have discovered new degrees of human faculties, their qualities, their laws of action and development. . . .

"His reports were at first listened to with distrust or derision. They gradually arrested the attention of a few thoughtful men who took the trouble to study and explain them. . . . And it is not to be denied that the steadily increasing influence which his teachings are exerting upon human society is a phenomenon in some respects quite unprecedented. . . .

"It is more than a century since this illustrious Swede commenced the publication of his theological writings. . . . No special effort was made in his life time to attract public attention to their contents. The press of the period seems scarcely to have known of their existence. Quietly, but steadily, however, they have gained readers and their doctrines, converts, until now his disciples may be found in every Christian land; his works in the language of every civilized people; and his doctrines more or less leavening the pulpit teachings of every Christian sect." (See pp. xxv-xxvii.)

"While there are many to whom Swedenborg's writings have proved unintelligible, . . . there is a class which in this age of applied science has been multiplying throughout the Christian world with fearful rapidity, for whom the writings of Swedenborg seem to have a providential mission. . . . Of the already large number of this class who owe to the writings of Swedenborg the restoration of their impaired faith in the Divine authority of the Word, the writer

gratefully acknowledges himself to be one. It has also been his good fortune to know many others who have been delivered from the bonds of dreary and hopeless unbelief by touching the hem of the same garment." (See pp. lxv-lxvi.)

"No judgment of Swedenborg as a teacher of spiritual truths will deserve to be final or conclusive, that does not take proper notice of one feature of his illuminated writings, which has never failed, we believe, to impress every one who has given them careful consideration. . . . They offer at every turn tests by which, if conflicting with the teachings of the Bible, they could have been at once exposed and consigned to oblivion. . . .

"No one, so far as I am aware, has ever convicted Swedenborg of being inconsistent with himself in any construction he has ever put upon any sentence or word of the Sacred Scriptures, nor in anything he has communicated of the states of existence beyond the grave. Whatever else may be said of his teachings, they are certainly not the incoherent combinations of an unsound mind." (See pp. lxxiv-lxvv.)

"As an ethical writer, Swedenborg has no peer in any literature outside of the Bible. . . . It is to be regretted that the prejudices which have prevailed against him in the ecclesiastical world, but which happily are fast fading out, have prevented his works from receiving from ethical writers the attention they deserve. It seems hardly credible that a writer so learned and so catholic in his literary tastes and judgments as Sir James Macintosh, should have attempted to write a history of the progress of Ethical Philosophy without once mentioning the name of Swedenborg. It may even be doubted if he ever opened one of Swedenborg's works. It is yet more remarkable that the best treatise that has been written on Ethical Science prior or subsequent to Swedenborg's time, by Dr. H. Martensen, should not contain an allusion to the teachings of the greatest authority living or dead upon that subject. . . . Coleridge had the courage to say that 'As a moralist Swedenborg is

above all praise.' And it is safe to predict that any book that shall fairly embody the ethical teachings of Swedenborg, would soon displace every treatise on Ethical Science that has yet been printed." (See pp. lxxvii-lxxviii.)

In 1854 on his return from a visit to Hayti, Mr. Bigelow was detained some weeks on the Island of St. Thomas. At the hotel he made the chance acquaintance of a Danish lawyer named Kjerulff. In the course of a conversation issuing from a remark which Mr. Bigelow made about the character of Abraham as given in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, Mr. Kjerulff asked if he had read any of the writings of Swedenborg, and added that Swedenborg explained the chapter in his "Arcana Cœlestia." Mr. Kjerulff happened to have the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia" in his possession; so on request he looked it up and brought it to his friend. Mr. Bigelow pauses in the narrative to recite some of his past religious history to show how far he had gone in the direction of infidelity and irreligion. He then proceeds to give the impressions made by the first paragraphs of the book in hand. The following passages are taken from the second edition of "The Bible That Was Lost and Is Found."

"Having perused these introductory paragraphs, I turned to chapter 12 to see what the privileged Swede had to say in behalf of Abram. After reciting the chapter at length, he proceeded to give what was entitled 'The Internal Sense,' and in terms which were calculated to arrest my attention. They ran as follows. . . .

"Then follows an exposition of what Swedenborg terms the interior or spiritual meaning of each verse, I might say of almost every word of each verse of the chapter, and occupying forty-five broad octavo pages. I could not make much out of his exegesis; but I was a little disappointed in one respect. Nothing was farther from my thoughts than to suppose that in this book, written over a hundred years ago, of which I had never before seen a copy, and to which,

in all my not inconsiderable reading of the English classics, I had rarely seen an allusion, I should find anything that could change or in the least modify my opinion of Abram or of the Bible. I read from curiosity merely, expecting to drop the book as soon as I came to something—and I did not in the least doubt that I soon should—that would be so absurd, or improbable, or illogical, as would justify me, without rudeness, in returning the book to my Danish friend with thanks.

"Though I understood but imperfectly what I read, I did not find what I was looking for; I found nothing that I could point to and say, 'There, you see your man Swedenborg must have been either a fool or an imposter, or both.' On the other hand, I did find several curious and striking things which piqued my curiosity. For example, his opening comments on the first verse of the chapter showed me that at least I was following a thoughtful guide. I had never heard nor read anything like it before. (See pp. 30-32.) . . . This idea, that the Word had degrees of significance which varied and expanded in exact proportion to the spirituality of a man's life, was one that had never crossed my mind before, in a way to distinguish the Bible as literature from Dante or Plato, and it seemed to me as though there might perhaps be something in it; but what? And how did he know, and where were the proofs? Still I could not say, 'This is nonsense; this is unscriptural,' though the distinction made between the chapters preceding the twelfth and those following . . . had a somewhat heretical not to say profane ring. I was, however, so pleased to find that any one had found a way of retaining his faith in the divine origin of the Bible, without being obliged to accept its account of the creation as history, that I did not feel like having Swedenborg burned as a heretic for that. In spite of these redeeming features of his writings, however, I did not in the least despair of bringing him to the stake before I had done with him. I persuaded myself that he had built up a theosophy from his imagination, and

I knew enough to know that no human imagination was capable of producing anything of that kind that would not bristle with weak points, which could not all escape the penetration of even so poor a theologian as I was. So I turned to other places to see what he said. . . . In this way I spent the entire day, I looked through the whole volume. . . . To my mortification, it began to dawn upon me that it was unintelligible to me, much for the same reason that the *Méchanique Céleste* would have been. While I ran upon many things that were quite new to me and seemed wise, I did not find anything upon which I could move to put the author out of court. On the contrary, the desire to read on grew by what it fed on, and begat a longing to know something of the author's personality.

"When Mr. Kjerulff came in to dinner that evening, I said to him that I had spent the day with his friend Swedenborg. . . . I asked if he had any biography of Swedenborg. . . . He replied . . . that he had in his luggage a collection of documents relating to Swedenborg compiled by a Mr. Bush, of New York, where he said I would find, in the testimony of Swedenborg's contemporaries, the best of evidence in regard to his singular purity of life, his conspicuous elevation of character, and the completeness of his consecration to the service of his Master. . . . I begged Mr. Kjerulff to let me see it. He promptly complied with my wishes. . . . I read the book almost at a sitting. My first feeling when I laid it down was of mingled surprise and mortification that I had lived till then in such dense ignorance of the career and work of so remarkable a man, at once so great and so good as Swedenborg was there shown to have been, while I had spent so much of my life in trying to make myself familiar with the lives of men who were unworthy to unloose the latchets of his shoes. Whatever doubts I had entertained of Swedenborg's good faith and sincerity, this book effectually dispelled. . . . These convictions naturally increased my curiosity to know more of his writings, and especially of his theology." (See pp. 35-38.)

At last Mr. Bigelow and Mr. Kjerulff left St. Thomas for New Orleans; and Mr. Bigelow prevailed upon his friend to take with him all the books he had by or about Swedenborg. He made record of the trip as follows:

"Our voyage was prolonged both by calms and storms, and more than twenty days elapsed. . . . I do not recollect but one day in all that interval . . . that I did not pore over these writings. In fact they absorbed all my time that was not devoted to eating and sleeping. It would not be possible to convey to any one, who had not had a similar experience, the effect they produced on me, . . . the complete revolution they wrought in all my opinions about spiritual matters, and especially about the Bible. . . . It seemed to me that every line I read removed some difficulty, cleared up some doubt, illuminated some mystery, revealed spiritual wealth in the Word of which before I had no conception. . . . I felt literally that whereas I was blind, now I saw; as if my eyes had opened to a world of which till then I had seen only the reflection or shadow. . . . The terms in which the Rev. John Clowes described the impression produced on him by his first perusal of Swedenborg's 'True Christian Religion,' would at one time have seemed to me rhapsodical and extravagant. They now seem to me perfectly natural and not in the least exaggerated." (See pp. 39-40.)

"I will only add to this confession made many years ago, that I do not yet know of any book or lights outside of Swedenborg and his interpreters which could have solved the difficulties which confronted me in trying to find the proof in its letter, that 'The Word was God'; and my difficulties, I am persuaded, were not unlike, nor less formidible than those which thousands, nay hundreds of thousands, are constantly stumbling over in every Christian land." (See pp. 104-5.)

The next American for our consideration at this time is the disciple of Wesley, RANDOLPH SINKS FOSTER (1820-1903). Among the eminent and influential leaders of the

Methodist Church in the last half of the nineteenth century, Bishop Foster was one of the foremost. His spontaneous and genuine tribute to Swedenborg's greatness is all the more remarkable because it was pronounced in the shade of the great man's home, and appeared in the principal Methodist organ, the *Christian Advocate*. During the early eighties Bishop Foster made extended tours through Europe and the East. In 1883 he visited Sweden, and wrote from Stockholm the letter from which the following quotation is made. Speaking of the Methodist Church in Stockholm, he says:

"The Church is beautifully located at the corner of one of the small parks in the midst of the city, and directly alongside the grounds which surrounded the home of the great Swedish Seer. His home has been demolished and the garden, which was still uninvaded ten years ago, is now covered with new buildings; but vandalism has spared the little library in which he wrote his strange but wonderful books. Men that see farther and think deeper than the average herd do not always escape obloquy; but they do not easily die. Emanuel Swedenborg will live in the souls of men long after many of his shallow traducers have sunk into oblivion." (*Christian Advocate*, July 12, 1883, page 441.)

It is historically significant and fitting that in this warm and eloquent tribute the Methodist Church should be connected with the name and fame of Swedenborg. In this respect Bishop Foster is typical of the relation between the Methodist Church and the religious teaching of Swedenborg.

Of all Americans who have called attention to the writings of Swedenborg, one stands pre-eminent in public esteem,—Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882).

Emerson did more than any other man to introduce Swedenborg to literary circles. His essay in "Representative Men" was a bold contribution towards fixing Sweden-

borg's historical position; for although mistaken in the representative character assigned to him, it placed Swedenborg at once among six of the greatest men of the world, in company with Plato, Shakespeare, Goethe, and Napoleon.

Emerson's interests were predominantly literary, and Swedenborg seems to have appealed to him strongly for literary purposes; he even made it the fashion in some quarters to refer to Swedenborg to help out literary expression. The frequent mention of Swedenborg, especially by New England writers, during the fifties, as well as the number of magazine articles with references to him that appeared about that time, is due largely, if not mainly, to the influence of Emerson's essay.

While it is true that it takes a "whole college" of ordinary men to appreciate Swedenborg's greatness, nevertheless Emerson did appreciate certain aspects of his greatness with unusual clearness and confidence, and there is no doubt that he was genuinely interested in some of Swedenborg's most characteristic and important ideas. Swedenborg's large and comprehensive views of life and of the universe and his deep insight into human nature, impressed Emerson most profoundly, and stirred his literary powers to extraordinary activity. Again and again he expresses himself in almost unmeasured superlatives as to Swedenborg's eminence both in general and in particular, and recurs to him as the supreme representative of some great idea.

But with all his literary enthusiasm for his subject, Emerson was constitutionally and temperamentally incapable of taking in all sides of Swedenborg's greatness. Swedenborg was pre-eminently and uncompromisingly Christian, although at some points he departed significantly from traditional orthodoxy; and he held with complete assurance to the Christian Bible as the Word of God, as the supreme religious revelation and authority. Emerson was neither Christian nor believer; he looked upon the Christian faith and the Christian Bible as out-grown relics of ancient superstition. If in the future Swedenborg's

grasp of the true nature of Christianity and the Bible comes to be taken as the measure of his greatness, then it must be said that Emerson failed to perceive his real greatness.

In fact it was Swedenborg's prodigious learning and his conquest of the world of nature rather than that of the world of spirit that won Emerson's admiration. Emerson was essentially a worshipper of ideas, and secondarily of representatives of ideas. To him Swedenborg was such a representative to an extraordinary degree. No one has more strongly affirmed the epochal significance of Swedenborg's influence; and in this he has been followed by many distinguished leaders of opinion.

Then, too, no one has surpassed Emerson in eulogy of Swedenborg; but in criticism he was distinctly inferior to Coleridge. He lacked Coleridge's breadth of interests. To Coleridge Swedenborg was an unexampled problem, intellectual and psychological; to Emerson he was a poet, a genius, a man of new ideas, but no problem. Coleridge had doubts and questions; he was amazed, he wondered. Emerson rendered judgment, confident of having mastered his subject; for him there were no intellectual problems, only literary achievement, and Swedenborg served this purpose.

It is no easy task to select fair samples of Emerson's opinion about Swedenborg, especially the passages which show his appreciation at its highest. Not counting the essay in "Representative Men," there are over eighty refences to Swedenborg in Emerson's works; of these, forty-three are in his "Journal". The most deliberate statements are naturally found in the essay in "Representative Men", and from this the larger part of the following quotations are taken. (See The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Centenary Edition, Vol. IV, Boston and New York, 1903.)

"I have sometimes thought that he would render the greatest service to modern criticism, who should draw the

line of relation that subsists between Shakespeare and Swedenborg." (P. 94.)

"This man [Swedenborg] no doubt led the most real life of any man then in the world: and now, when the royal and ducal Frederics, Christians, and Brunswicks of that day have slid into oblivion, he begins to spread himself into the minds of thousands. As happens in great men, he seemed, by the variety and amount of his powers, to be a composition of several persons. His frame is on a larger scale and possesses the advantages of size." (P. 98.)

"The genius which was to penetrate the science of the age with a far more subtle science; to pass beyond the bounds of space and time, venture into the dim spirit realm, and attempt to establish a new religion in the world,—began its lessons in quarries and forges, in the smelting pot and crucible, in ship-yards and dissecting-rooms. No one man is perhaps able to judge of the merits of his works on so many subjects. . . . It seems that he anticipated much science of the nineteenth century." (Pp. 101-2.)

"A colossal soul, he lies vast abroad on his times, uncomprehended by them, and requires a long focal distance to be seen; suggests, as Aristotle, Bacon, Selden, Humbolt, that a certain vastness of learning, or quasi-omnipresence of the human soul in nature, is possible." (P. 102.)

"In Swedenborg, those who are best acquainted with modern books will most admire the merit of mass. One of the missouriums and mastodons of literature, he is not to be measured by whole colleges of ordinary scholars. His stalwart presence would flutter the gowns of a university." (P. 103.)

"His writings would be a sufficient library to a lonely and athletic student; and the 'Economy of the Animal Kingdom' is one of those books which by the sustained dignity of thinking, is an honor to the human race." (P. 105.)

"These grand rhymes or returns in nature . . . delighted the prophetic eye of Swedenborg; and he must be reckoned

a leader in that revolution, which, by giving to science an idea, has given to an aimless accumulation of experiments, guidance and form and a beating heart." (P. 110.)

"The 'Animal Kingdom' is a book of wonderful merits. It was written with the highest end,—to put science and the soul, long estranged from each other, at one again." (P. 111.)

"It is remarkable that this sublime genius decides peremptorily for the analytic, against the synthetic method; and, in a book whose genius is a daring poetic synthesis, claims to confine himself to a rigid experience." (P. 112.)

"Few knew as much about nature and her subtle manners, or expressed more subtly her goings. . . . That 'nature exists entire in leasts' is a favorite thought of Swedenborg. (P. 114.) . . . The hardihood and thoroughness of his study of nature required a theory of forms also. (P. 115.) . . . Was it strange that a genius so bold should take the last step also, should conceive that he might attain the science of all sciences, to unlock the meaning of the world? In the first volume of the 'Animal Kingdom,' he broaches the subject in a remarkable note:

> In our doctrine of Representations and Correspondences we shall treat of both these symbolical and typical resemblances, and of the astonishing things which occur, I will not say in the living body only, but throughout nature, and which correspond so entirely to supreme and spiritual things that one would swear that the physical world was purely symbolical of the spiritual world. . . .

"The fact thus explicitly stated is implied in all poetry, in allegory, in fable, in the use of emblems and in the structure of language. . . . Swedenborg first put the fact into a detached and scientific statement, because it was habitually present to him, and never not seen." (P. 117.)

"The correspondence between thoughts and things henceforward occupied him." (P. 120.)

"Swedenborg styles himself in the title-page of his books, 'Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ'; and by force of intellect, and in effect, he is the last Father in the Church, and he is

not likely to have a successor. No wonder that his depth of ethical wisdom should give him influence as a teacher." (P. 121.)

"There is no such problem of criticism as his theological writings, their merits are so commanding. . . . He is a rich discoverer, and of things which most import us to know. . . . What earnestness and weightiness,—his eye never roving, without one swell of vanity, or one look to self in any common form of literary pride! A theoretic or speculative man, but whom no practical man in the universe could affect to scorn. Plato is a gownsman. . . . But this mystic is awful to Caesar. Lycurgus himself would bow.

"The moral insight of Swedenborg, the correction of popular errors, the announcement of ethical laws, take him out of comparison with any other modern writer, and entitle him to a place, vacant for some ages, among the lawgivers of mankind. That slow but commanding influence which he has acquired, like that of other religious geniuses, must be excessive also, and have its tides, before it subsides into a permanent amount." (Pp. 123-4.)

"It requires, for his just apprehension, almost a genius equal to his own." (P. 132.)

"The genius of Swedenborg, largest of all modern souls in this department of thought, wasted itself in the endeavor to reanimate and conserve what had already arrived at its natural term, and, in the great secular Providence, was retiring from its prominence before western modes of thought and expression. Swedenborg and Behmen both failed by attaching themselves to the Christian symbol, instead of to the moral sentiment, which carries innumerable christianities, humanities, divinities, in its bosom." (P. 135.)

The following passages are found elsewhere in Emerson's writings:

"There is one man of genius who has done much for this philosophy of life, whose literary value has never yet been rightly estimated;—I mean Emanuel Swedenborg. The

most imaginative of men, yet writing with the precision of a mathematician, he endeavored to engraft a purely philosophical ethics on the popular Christianity of his time. Such an attempt of course must have difficulty which no genius could surmount. But he saw and showed the connection between nature and the affections of the soul. He pierced the emblematic or spiritual character of the visible, audible, tangible world." (See Works, as above, Vol. I, pp. 112-3, The American Scholar, 1837.)

"Swedenborg, of all men in the recent ages, stands eminently for the translator of nature into thought. I do not know the man in history to whom things stood so uniformly for words. Before him the metamorphosis continually plays. Every thing on which his eye rests, obeys the impulses of the moral nature. . . .

"There was this perception in him which makes the poet or the seer an object of awe and terror; namely, that the same man or society of men may wear one aspect to themselves and their companions, and a different aspect to higher intelligences." (See Works, Vol. III, pp. 35-6, The Poet, 1844.)

"I count the genius of Swedenborg and Wordsworth as the agents of a reform in philosophy, the bringing poetry back to Nature." (See Works, Vol. VIII, p. 66, Poetry and Imagination, 1875.)

"Swedenborg had a vast genius and announced many things true and admirable, though always clothed in somewhat sad and Stygian colors. These truths passing out of his system into general circulation, are now met with every day, qualifying the views and creeds of all churches and of men of no church. And I think we are all aware of a revolution in opinion." (See Works, Vol. VIII, pp. 327-8, Immortality, 1875.)

"The most remarkable step in the religious history of recent ages is that made by the genius of Swedenborg." (*Ibid.*)

"I think another important step was made by the doctrine

of Swedenborg, a sublime genius who gave a scientific exposition of the part played severally by man and woman in the world, and showed the difference of sex to run through nature and through thought. Of all Christian sects this is at this moment the most vital and aggressive." (See Works, Vol. II, pp. 415-6, Woman, 1881.)

The following are from the several volumes of Emerson's "Journal":

"Oct. 9, 1829.—I am glad to see that interpretations of the Scripture like those of the New Jerusalem Church can be accepted in our community. The most spiritual and sublime sense is put upon the various historical passages of the New Testament. The interpretation of the passages is doubtless wholly false. The apostle John in Patmos and our Savior in his talking, meant no such things as the commentator says he meant. But the sentiment which the commentator puts in their mouths is nevertheless true and eternal. The wider that sentiment can be spread and the more effect it can have on men's lives, the better." (Vol. II, p. 267.)

"June 21, 1838.—Swedenborg is a new classification." (Vol. IV, p. 487.)

"Oct. 21, 1838.—A great colossal soul, I fancy, was Swedenborg." (Vol. V, p. 98.)

"Oct. 17, 1840—Who was Swedenborg? A man who saw God and nature for a fluid moment." (Vol. V, p. 477.)

"1841.—Then I said, surely I see that the Swedenborgian finds a sweetness in his Church and is enveloped by it in a love and society that haunts him by night and by day." (Vol. VI, p. 76.)

"April 5, 1842.— I began to write poetry, and was driven at once to think of Swedenborg as the person who, of the men in the recent ages, stands eminently for the translator of Nature into thought. I do not know a man in history to whom things stood so uniformly for words." (Vol. VI, p. 184.)

"June 16, 1842.—In town I also talked with Sampson Reed, of Swedenborg, and the rest. . . . In regard to Swedenborg, I commended him as a grand poet. Reed wished that, if I admired the poetry, I should feel it as a fact. I told him, All my concern is with the subjective truth of Jesus's or Swedenborg's or Homer's remark, not at all with the object." (Vol. VI, p. 219.)

"1845.—There were Swedenborgs in those days, Missouriums, Mastodons of literature, not to be measured by a whole population of modern scholars. (Vol. VII, p. 120.)

"Oct. 27, 1845.—As for King Swedenborg, I object to his cardinal position in morals that evils should be shunned as sins. I hate preaching. I shun evils as evils. Does he not know—Charles Lamb did—that every poetic mind is a pagan, and to this day prefers Olympian Jove, Apollo, and the Muses and the Fates, to all the barbarous indigestion of Calvin and the Middle Ages?

"Great king is King Swedenborg. I will not deny him his matchless length and breadth." (Vol. VII, p. 122.)

"May 3, 1849.—I look on Swedenborg as on Kant, Newton, Leibniz, Goethe, Humboldt, men of larger stature than others, and possessing very great advantages in that preternatural size." (Vol. VIII, p. 16.)

"May 25, 1849.—Swedenborg was the last Christian." (Vol. VIII, p. 22.)

The above quotations show unequivocally that Emerson placed Swedenborg in the front rank of the great men of the world. As a philosopher, a leader in science, a creative literary genius, a religious teacher, a new moral and intellectual force of immeasurable importance; in all these respects, Swedenborg was given an eminent position. It is true that with certain aspects of Swedenborg's life and doctrine, Emerson was decidedly unsympathetic. His anti-Christian attitude made him averse to the whole body of Swedenborg's exegetical and distinctively Christian teachings; and his thoroughgoing naturalism rendered him intol-

erant of all supernatural claims, and especially of the reports Swedenborg gave of his experiences in the spiritual world. In these respects Emerson found Swedenborg very distasteful, and he indulges in strong expressions of dissent, and at times of ridicule and sarcasm. Taking into account the mood and whim of the moment, these expressions are not to be considered as typical, or as truly representative, of his appreciation at its best. In fact it may be said that such expressions reveal more of Emerson than they do of Swedenborg; and they raise questions, religious, ethical, and psychological, many of which are yet to be settled in the public mind.

The record of Emerson's study of Swedenborg is by no means as complete as could be desired. There is no specific statement in his "Journal"—where if at all such a statement would be most naturally made—of devoting himself to the reading of Swedenborg; as we find, for instance, in Coleridge's letters, and in the letters and diaries of so many distinguished persons.

Emerson's interest in Swedenborg was partly determined by the extraordinary influence of two men, Sampson Reed of Boston and J. J. G. Wilkinson of London. Emerson became acquainted with Reed about the year 1826, and from that time on they seem to have enjoyed much friendly intercourse, especially on the subject of Swedenborg. Emerson and Wilkinson corresponded. Wilkinson's letter of thanks for the gift of "Representative Men" is dated Feb. 5, 1850. In his "Journal" Emerson writes: "Wilkinson, Swedenborg's pupil, after one hundred years, a philosopher-critic with a mind like Bacon."

Emerson, it seems, introduced Swedenborg to Carlyle. In 1834 he made Carlyle a present of Sampson Reed's "The Growth of the Mind." In the course of the correspondence which followed, Emerson remarks: "They (the Swedenborgians) are to me, however, deeply interesting, as a sect which I think must contribute more than all other sects to the new faith which must arise out of all." This impression

and idea may have been derived from his intercourse with Sampson Reed.

A very careful study of Emerson's Works would be needed to determine Swedenborg's influence upon him; but there is no question that directly and indirectly through Emerson Swedenborg's influence has been extended to many others.

Emerson's essay on Swedenborg was both a symptom and a stimulant. It was the outcome of an interest in Swedenborg which pervaded a group of theologians, preachers, and literary people in and around Boston about the middle of the last century, a group perhaps characteristically represented by the members of the "Brook Farm," and the "New England Transcendentalists"; on the other hand the essay stimulated and extended this interest not only within this group, but in a still wider circle.

Some of the outstanding figures were Theodore Parker, James Freeman Clarke, Edward Everett Hale, F. H. Hedge, Sidney Willard, and a little more remotely E. H. Sears, Henry James, Theophilus Parsons, and among the women Margaret Fuller, Julia Ward Howe, Lydia Maria Child, Louisa M. Alcott. These and others have left opinions about Swedenborg, opinions which for the most part have a subjective rather than an objective value.

Seeking the historical occasion of this interest, perhaps the most significant circumstance is, that about 1818 a little band of Harvard students began to read Swedenborg more or less in concert. After graduation they continued the reading, and in the course of time joined with others. In 1818 the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem was instituted. Prominent among the early members were these Harvard graduates. Thomas Worcester became in 1821 minister of the society. Sampson Reed and his brother Caleb, T. B. Hayward, John H. Wilkins, and Theophilus Parsons with several others, all college mates, were influential in the society as well as in the community at large. In 1826 Sampson Reed and Emerson formed an ac-

quaintance which became historic. Hobart's "Life of Swedenborg" appeared in 1831. Swedenborg's works began to be published in Boston in 1825. These circumstances taken together furnished the conditions of a knowledge of Swedenborg by the public. As a consequence he became a frequent topic of conversation in social and literary circles; lectures were given to acquaint the public with him; magazine articles and books appeared to interpret, to expound, and to promote or refute his views.

Rev. Theodore Parker (1810-1860) shared this interest, and made himself acquainted to some extent at least with Swedenborg's history and views. The following extract is probably as well considered as any reference he made to Swedenborg.

"Newton Corner, Aug. 24, 1853.

Dear Sir,—The article in the *Massachusetts Quarterly,* on Swedenborg, was written by Henry James, of New York. Emerson, in his "Representative Men," has given the best criticism which I have ever seen of Swedenborg. But that is not adequate to the purpose you refer to. Swedenborg has had the fate to be worshipped as a half-god, on the one side; and on the other to be despised and laughed at. It seems to me that he was a man of genius, of wide learning, of deep and genuine piety. . . . The Swedenborgians have a calm and religious beauty in their lives which is much to be admired.

Theo. Parker."

(See Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, by John Weiss, N. Y., 1864, Vol. I, p. 356, Letter to Albert Sanford.)

The references of Rev. James Freeman Clarke (1810-1888) to Swedenborg are uniformly candid and well considered, though sometimes colored by mistaken points of view and by quite natural misapprehensions. The intellectual atmosphere and the religious conditions under which he read Swedenborg were not altogether favorable to a just

appreciation of Swedenborg's historical position, or his most distinctive and fundamental teachings; nevertheless he was perhaps on the whole a more sympathetic reader than either Emerson or Parker, not to speak of others of the same group. The following quotations give fairly his opinions as to Swedenborg's greatness and influence.

"There were four men who lived during the last century, who all lived to be very old, whose lives were contemporaneous during the largest part of the period from 1700 to 1800, who were different in many respects, but who were all alike in this power of turning time into thought and action. They were Swedenborg, Voltaire, Wesley, and Franklin. Perhaps no four men of the century exercised a greater influence on the age than these. Swedenborg's thought has been slowly filtering into philosophy and theology, spiritualizing both. . . . His thought, so subtle and so deep, is gradually conquering the materialism of philosophy and theology, and so bringing down what he called the New Jerusalem. . . . But what a vast amount of thought and study; what patient labor on works which no one in that day, and but few even in ours, have cared to read; what entire confidence in the power of truth; what fidelity to his thought, persistency in his purpose, cool ardor, patient energy, marked the life of the solitary thinker! He was the most lonely man on the earth in his day; hardly a soul sympathized with him or understood him. Yet he worked on, without haste or rest, an incarnation of thought, sure that somewhere men would be found to read and understand what God had told him to say. Surely *he* 'redeemed the time.' . . .

"As I look back and remember the books I have read, I find those that have done my mind the most good are . . . those which I have eaten and drunk, and made part of myself. . . . Let a person know all about the Bible, let him know all of Shakespeare, or let him be perfectly familiar with the best of Lord Bacon's writings, or of Leibniz, or of

Swedenborg, or of Plato, or Dante, or Goethe,—any one of them, and he will be a highly accomplished man."

(See Self-Culture, by James Freeman Clarke, Boston, 1882, pp. 76-82, The Use of Time.)

"Swedenborg, again, has, from the basis of a spiritual insight, protested against the antichrist of Orthodoxy. The profound mysticism of his soul, joined with a most healthy intellect, has given to us in his writings a system of rational spiritualism which no theologian can neglect, except to his own loss. The great value of it I think is, that it lifts us above dogma into the light of the living facts and the permanent law of the spirit. . . . His spiritual insight was, perhaps, the most powerful vouchsafed to any man in these latter days."

(See Vexed Questions in Theology, Boston, 1886, p. 56, Christ and His Antichrists.)

"While Wesley was made the mediator of a new moral force flowing out of Christianity, Emanuel Swedenborg became the organ of a new spiritual philosophy, the power of which is hardly yet understood, but which seems likely to leaven all religious thought. . . . But Swedenborg did not go out of Christianity to find his ideas. Like George Fox and John Wesley, he found them in Christ."

(See Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg, by Benjamin Worcester, Boston, 1883, p. 416.)

Rev. Edward Everett Hale (1822-1909) occupied a prominent position in the group of which Emerson, Parker, and Clarke were distinguished leaders. His opinions of Swedenborg therefore may be taken as typical of those of the educated classes in New England during his lifetime.

"Swedenborgianism has done the liberating work of the last century. . . The wave which Swedenborg started lasts to this day. . . . The statements of Swedenborg's religious works have revolutionized theology."*

*The above quotation was from a lecture. In reply to a query concerning it, Mr. Hale wrote as follows:

(See Life and Mission of Emanuel Swedenborg, by Benjamin Worcester, Boston, 1883, p. 416.)

During his lifetime the Rev. Richard Heber Newton (1840-1914) filled important pulpits in Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere. He was a versatile, vigorous, and independent writer. An eager student of modern life and conditions,—not, however, to the neglect of history,—he took some advanced positions with a freedom that was somewhat disturbing to some of his Episcopal brethren. With characteristic openmindedness and fidelity to history, he has given Swedenborg due credit for renewing the face of Christianity in its thought above the future life:

"The first really new conception of the character of immortality given to the world for eighteen centuries came through the great savant and philosopher and theologian of Sweden—Emanuel Swedenborg, who died in 1772. Whatever the nature of the sources of his thought, its character was revolutionary. He reconstructed the whole idea of the hereafter. For the first time in eighteen centuries—one might almost say for the first time in the history of humanity—it took on sane and sensible forms, and became rational and conceivable, natural and necessary.

"Swedenborg's thought has been slowly leavening the great churches of Christianity in the western world; and under its influence the traditional conception of immortality

---

"I do not remember where I said this; but as it is quoted I have no doubt I wrote it. I can not use too strong expressions in saying that the influence of Swedenborg in the 19th century was all important in England. And that he brought into what is called the religion and theology of England a life that was wholly new. Any person of intelligence who studies what is called the religious life of England after his work began, would testify to such effect wrought by him.

Truly yours,
Edward E. Hale."

(From a letter of May 21, 1909, to the Rev. Clarence Lathbury, now of Cleveland, Ohio.)

has been unconsciously changing. A veritable new growth is spreading before our eyes today—a growth entirely unparalleled in the history of Christianity."

(See *Mind,* N. Y., August, 1900, Vol. IV, No. 5, p. 322.)

Rev. Lyman Abbott (1835-1922), the popular preacher, Pastor of the Plymouth Church, Brooklyn (succeeding Henry Ward Beecher), and Editor of the *Outlook,* was a reader of Swedenborg, and assigned him an important position of leadership in modern religious thought. His appreciation of Swedenborg is briefly stated in the following private letter:

"New York, Jan. 5, 1905.

"My dear Mr. Grant:—

I thank you for your letter of Jan. 2. The works of Emanuel Swedenborg are in my library, and I have long believed that the universal church is indebted to him for much of its modern conception of religion as an inner life—the life of God in the soul of man.

Yours sincerely,

Lyman Abbott."

(Letter to the Rev. H. H. Grant, Cincinnati, Ohio; on file with the American New-Church Evidence Society, Cambridge, Mass.)

Rt. Rev. Charles David Williams (1860-1923), Bishop of Michigan, a man of great ability and independence, was outspoken in acknowledging his obligation to Swedenborg, as shown by the following letter:

"I have been an interested reader of Emanuel Swedenborg's works through my whole life, particularly in my early ministry. I have found much illumination and inspiration in that reading. I have also read a great deal of New-Church literature, particularly the writings of Chauncey Giles; in fact that literature has been in a large degree formative of my religious and theological convictions."

Charles D. Williams."

(See *The New-Church League Journal,* November, 1916.)

The list of such testimonials might be added to indefinitely. Such names as Phillips Brooks, J. H. Vincent, S. Parkes Cadman, Theodore J. Munger, W. D. Howells, Henry James, Helen Keller, and many others, come to mind. The testimonies may be well summed up in the language of Henry Ward Beecher: "No man can know the theology of the nineteenth century who has not read Swedenborg." (See "My Religion", by Helen Keller, p. 53).

These testimonies are unanimous in attributing to Swedenborg greatness of character, elevation of mind and spirit, rare insight into the true nature of religion, and a growing influence upon the religious thought of the modern world.

We may wonder why Swedenborg's influence has not been even greater than it actually is; why the broad acceptance of his teachings and his claims has not been more general. After giving due weight to the difficulties which naturalism and worldliness present, we must recognize and appreciate that much of his thought is in a region that lies much above our ordinary reach. Worldly interests, ingrained habits of thought and feeling, and the spiritual inertia of men, need to be overcome; and this involves a slow process of moral and religious education. Swedenborg's works need to be published more widely, understood more fully, and expounded more clearly.

LEWIS F. HITE.

SPIRITUAL SIGHT.

By John H. Ball

THOSE who have given little thought to the subject may easily assume that man at birth comes into the full possession of the faculty of sight. How erroneous this idea is, soon appears when we analyze the question. Infants, although they see, have no sense of distance. The mind has to be educated by experience before it is able to estimate even approximately the location of any object out of its reach. The little child will hold up its hands and try to grasp the moon, if it happens to attract its attention. "Ye must be born again" has a more definite and particular meaning than appears at first sight.

The reason man must be born again (born spiritually) is because previously the faculties by which he can live spiritually are embryonic. It follows from this that in relation to spiritual things every man is born blind. Consequently he has by nature no true conception of spiritual things. Those who are unregenerate can have little conception of spiritual truth. They imagine it to be merely an intellectual comprehension of certain written statements. In other words, they conclude that it is "scientifics." We read in the Word: "That was the true light which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world." Most people conclude that this refers to the Lord's teaching, and that the application is to all those who are acquainted with it. But the light referred to is spiritual light, and the world is the spiritual world, which man comes into with some consciousness when he is born again.

The enlightenment at first is crude, and misleading, and altogether similar to the state of the natural born infant. There is no sense of proportion; and in our infant state we

are apt to imagine that the things of faith have only to be seen to be possessed. Spiritually we try to grasp the moon. There is no spiritual subject on which our conceptions are not at first full of error. Yet this is the time when we are most in danger of becoming dogmatic.

Spiritual enlightenment is not merely an intellectual attainment; nor is mere intellect ever sufficient help towards it. University professors, eminent divines, and the most scholarly men in philosophy and metaphysics may be as blind as the most uneducated, if they are not regenerating.

There is a difficulty in dealing with this subject. It is impossible to convey to some persons a correct idea of what constitutes spiritual enlightenment. They either have it or they have it not. It cannot be made a subject of commerce. It is as futile to try to describe what it consists in as it is to try to explain to one who was born blind what natural light is. He can only form an idea in terms of the faculties he possesses.

What then, you may say, is the use of talking about it? Can any useful purpose be served by telling people there is something they do not know, and cannot be told? That is a fair objection, but it can be satisfactorily answered for those who are teachable. There are in general no spiritual faculties into which all do not come who are born again; and it is the purpose of this article to endeavor to point out the way to the new birth. The attainment is not dependent on any direct effort of the natural man; it is *purely* a dispensation of Providence. Its attainment is never accompanied by any increased self-importance; nor is it always recognized for what it is. The only conscious effort that helps towards this state is that of faithfulness to the things we believe to be right,—obedience to the Decalogue and faith in the Word.

The first effect of the opening of man's spiritual sight is that he sees men as trees walking. He thinks the fulfilment of all spiritual effort is merely the literal carrying out of principles. He does not yet understand that man is more

than principles, however faithfully he may live up to them. The young man said, "All these things have I done from my youth up." Let not anyone imagine that he may become properly spiritual by studying theology, or that he knows sufficiently the spiritual sense of the Word when he has learned the correspondences related to many particular texts. It is like a child who has learned the alphabet only, thinking it can read and write without any further instruction.

There is one indispensable qualification to the attainment of this enlightened state, and that is charity—charity as an active principle of the life. A knowledge of the doctrine of charity is not enough. It need not be reduced to any particular form of words, if only it is reduced to action.

The Lord said "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God." These are weighty words. Most people think they refer only to the future. They think of an objective seeing. They imagine a being so many feet high who shall appear at some distance, and be viewed as we view each other. This crude idea is as foreign to the true meaning as it could well be. The words "God" and "good" (in the supreme sense) are interchangeable wherever they occur in the Scriptures; and it is often a very great assistance to a right understanding to remember this fact. To see God is to perceive absolute goodness,—to be elevated from the state in which truth governs the life to that in which love prevails in deciding all questions. There is little appeal to external authority; and mistakes are less probable. It is a virtual fulfilment of the prophecy in Jeremiah:

> I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts and will be their God and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying know the Lord, for they shall all know me.

To see things spiritually is to see them from their qualities and not from their form, or bodily appearance. The old churchman says, This thing is good because I see it to

be true. The New-Churchman says, This thing is true because I see it to be good. Truths seen spiritually are seen rationally; and when seen rationally, they are seen in their true proportion or in ratio; and as all truth is some expression relating to the Grand Man, its importance is seen because its true function is perceived. In this state, men never sacrifice charity to any doctrinal dispute, nor do they who are spiritually enlightened arrogate to themselves the functions of the Divine Providence.

JOHN H. BALL.

Sydney, Australia.

"MIND AND PERSONALITY."*

PSYCHOLOGY has of recent years made signal advances. In mediaeval and even later times, far into our own day, psychology distinguished and named certain faculties and functions of the mind. After the manner of Aristotle, the mind was supposed to possess certain faculties which were exercised in their proper functions. When these faculties and their functions were completely enumerated and described, the field of psychology was exhausted. We have a classical example of this in Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding. Later, attention was directed to the connection between mental states and the functions of the nervous system, and an elaborate body of psycho-physics was built up. James's "Briefer Course" begins with a critical outline of this psycho-physics. In the meantime, there grew up, for the most part outside of professional circles, the doctrines and practice of mesmerism, hypnosis, and psycho-analysis, which dealt with persons rather than with faculties. Attempts were made to abandon the notion of faculties, and to study directly the mental operations, or functions, themselves. So we have three stages of psychological method, designated respectively faculty psychology, functional psychology, and psycho-analysis. Under the head of hypnosis, psychology has diverged from the normal to the psycho-pathic; and this has led to the study of the ground and nature of personality. Psycho-analysis has peered deeply into the early stages of

**Mind and Personality;* An Essay in Psychology and Philosophy. By William Brown, M.D., D.Sc., Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford; Hon. Consulting Psychologist, Bethlem Royal Hospital, London; Psychotherapist to King's College Hospital, London. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1927. 356 pp., 8vo. Price $3.50.

personal experience, and has thereby brought into prominence what is known as child psychology.

The book before us is an admirable summary of these several aspects of the field of psychology, and as such should have a place in every well constituted library. But it is more than a well digested summary; it is an extraordinarily mature philosophical discussion and exposition of the basic facts of mental life. The author is a man of sober judgment, ripe experience, and full scientific equipment. He is not only familiar with the classical, analytical, psychology, but is directly acquainted with the methods and results of penetrating the depths of personal consciousness, thereby gaining an insight into the nature of personality. It is from this point of view that he approaches and develops his subject. He appreciates the difficulty classical psychology encountered when it undertook to reconstruct the mental life out of the results of analysis. The method of analysis led to over simplification. When once the faculties and functions of the mind have been analyzed into concepts, ideas, sensations, sentiments, feelings, emotions, impulses, etc., the attempt to build up the concrete personal experience out of these elements proved a failure, and was doomed to failure from the first. When the mental life has been atomized in this way, it is no more possible to rebuild it than it is to rebuild the plant or animal when once it has been reduced to conceptual atoms and molecules. As a matter of fact, mental life is exceedingly complex, and any attempt to understand it must begin with that complexity. This is recognized and systematically dealt with by those who pursue the methods of hypnosis and psycho-analysis. These methods undertake to deal more effectively with personality as a whole; and the results have been interesting and important. The kind of analysis which faculty psychology and functional psychology carried out to the last extremes led to associational psychology and to psychology "without a soul." But when the depths of personality are sounded by well directed questions, and thus earlier and still earlier

memories are revived, the person is helped to tell his own story under expert direction, and extraordinary life-stories are evoked to furnish a key to the nature of personal life. One of the discoveries made by this method is that mental activities exhibit successive stages or layers, "degrees," of consciousness, which are built up one upon another, extending from the superficial to the depth of the subconscious, and that the inner or lower layers may be reached through the superficial layers.

Exploration of the various types and elements of personality has directed attention to the main tendency, or "ruling love," also called the "life-line" or "master sentiment," which makes the person to be an individual. This kind of psychology aims to tell the nature of personality in terms of the ruling love or life-force which operates throughout the history of the individual. The more detailed likes and dislikes, hopes, fears, and aspirations, motives and purposes, are traced back to more fundamental likes and dislikes, aspirations and purposes. From this point of view and by this method the author develops his subject with insight and comprehension.

Under the idea of Mind and Personality, the author brings together the usual features of traditional psychology and also the recent developments of pathological psychology. The idea of personality pervades and directs the whole course of the treatment.

After a well conceived and well written introduction, the book opens with a discussion of the Mind-Body problem and takes in the conditions of both health and disease. The discussion is extended to the relation of Mind to physical organism in general, or to the problem of mind and matter. This is followed by several chapters on the constitution and organization of the Self, including especially the functions of Instinct, Emotion, Sentiment, and Volition. A summary chapter on Experimental Psychology, an analysis of Mathematical Ability, and two well considered and wholesome chapters on Child Psychology and the problem of Ado-

lescence, prepare the way to the five chapters on Personality and Psycho-pathology, viz.: Psychology and Medicine, The Early Treatment of Mental Disease, Suggestion and Hypnosis, Psycho-analysis, and Dissociation and Mental Unity, respectively; the whole constituting a very comprehensive discussion of attempts to apply the results of recent psychological investigation to the conditions of health and disease. The substance of these chapters should be common knowledge, and should be the intimate possession of every household. Such knowledge should be a guide to undreamed of health, usefulness, and happiness. The remaining chapters deal successively with the Philosophy of Conduct and with Moral Standards, the Constitution and Development of Personality, Psychological Methods in the Study of Religion and the Content of Religious Experience, the Nature of Value or Values, and Survival after Death. These are all treated as phases or characters of Personality; in fact, the book is a thoughtful and penetrating discussion of what constitutes Personality.

The nature of Personality involves the deepest problems of psychology and metaphysics. At the first glance, the study of Personality would seem to involve especially and only the nature of Mind. But our mental life is deeply immersed in the body and in the external world, social and physical, and is so intimately associated with the states and activities of the body that ordinarily we do not distinguish between mind and body. We do not separate the ache from the aching tooth, and moreover it is I who ache, not merely the tooth. So in the case of all our bodily sensations. It is reflective experience and analysis that leads us to locate our sensations in the mind rather than in the objects. Ordinarily we say with complete satisfaction the grass is green, the sky is blue, the sound of the bell, sugar is sweet, and so on. In all these cases, the sensation is thought of as a quality of the object, and no distinction is made between the mind and the outer world of sense-objects. In other words, we virtually say and think in such cases that the mind is in the outer

world, in the world of colors, sounds, etc. All this is matter of common sense.

But when we begin to study the processes of sensation, we observe first of all the connection between the sense-organs and our sensations. We shut our eyes, and it makes the difference between light and darkness; the world of colors vanishes. We stop our ears, and the world of sounds is shut out from us. Next we observe the connection between our sense-organs and the brain. If the optic nerve be cut or diseased, we see no more; and so in the case of the other senses. This establishes a connection between the brain and our sensations, and an intimate knowledge of anatomy and physiology shows that special nerve cords run from the brain to the end organs of the senses. Further examination of these end-organs shows that they are adapted to the impact of agents from the outer world; the ear to the pulsations of the air waves, the eye to the impact of supposed ether waves. The situation becomes more complicated the more closely we look into it. First of all, the light waves, or the ether waves, are supposed to come from the sun; these are reflected by the various objects, or bodies, and strike upon the retina of the eye; this sets up a nerve current from retina to brain center. Then by some marvelous and mysterious co-incidence we have the sensations of light and colors, we see the blue sky, the green fields, the endless colors of the lake, etc.

Now we observe that by this complicated analysis we get sensation entirely out of the physical world. The ether waves are not colored, nor are the nerve currents. Color ceases to be found in the outer, physical, world; and as sensation is withdrawn into the mind. In this procedure, we begin to separate the mind from the outer world of bodies; and thereafter we have the world of physical and the world of sense objects on our hands, and the problem of their relation to each other. In the same procedure, we separate the mind from the brain and the rest of the body, and we have the problem of mind-state and brain-state; in

general, the problem of the relation between mind and body. These problems have taxed metaphysicians and psychologists throughout the history of philosophy, and no more severely than at the present day. As a result, we have various theories of the relation between mind and body. Of these, the "epiphenominal" is based on materialism, the theory of "parallelism" is based on scientific analysis of the physiological conditions of sensation, the theory of "interaction" is based on common sense and experience. The theory of "spiritual influx" is based on spiritualistic metaphysics. All these theories in so far as they aim to be systematic are based upon abstractions; the mind and the body are conceived in abstract separation from each other, and then the problem is to bring them together again. To accomplish this result, we need a more concrete view and understanding of mind and body.

The author gives close consideration to these theories, and states the objections to them clearly and convincingly. The objection to epiphenominalism is that all materialism is self-contradictory. The objection to parallelism is that it is a statement of the problem, not a solution. The obvious objection from the scientific point of view to the theory of interaction is, that it involves the assumed existence of the soul, which is physiologically irrelevant.

From the point of view of personality, purposive action is the characteristic feature of all living organisms. In purposive action, mind and body act as one; idea, impulse, and act occur in ordinary experience simultaneously. According to Professor James, ideas are motor, and if not inhibited pass into act of their own *momentum*. It is only when ideas are inhibited and volitions are obstructed that we distinguish them from the acts which properly follow, and separate the body from the mind. This close union of mind and body furnishes the ground for the various Behavioristic theories, which undertake to interpret all acts and states of consciousness in terms of behavior, that is, of bodily functions. In the case of the lower organisms, this explanation is plau-

sible; but it becomes more and more difficult as we ascend to the higher grades. In the case of man, the difficulties are greatest of all; but by extending the range of "conditioned reflexes," the attempt is made to cover the whole body of man's intellectual and emotional life. But this attempt encounters the stubborn fact that Behaviorism is a theory, and as such is a highly complicated intellectual and emotional structure, a highly wrought complex of conscious states and activities. No theory can escape the fact of consciousness, which is but another name for mental activity. Feelings, the feeling of beauty, our moods, pleasure, pain, joy, grief, affection, sensation, sentiment, ideas, desires, aspirations, ideals, perception, intuition, are all immediate facts of consciousness; they are felt qualities of experience which may or may not involve objective reference; they have an intimacy which is unanalysible, but yet recognizable and to some extent communicable. Behavioristic analysis and construction must neglect these immediacies—for they cannot be translated into bodily re-actions and movements—but must depend upon interpretation, inference, and hypothesis, all of which work with mediation. Behaviorism, like all forms of materialism, breaks down before the insistent and unimpeachable fact of consciousness, and falls into contradiction in the very act of interpretation.

Personality is involved in purposiveness; but it is characteristically identified with high degrees of mentality. A person, in the eyes of the law, is a responsible agent; and responsibility rests upon moral freedom and upon the capacity for rational choice. Personality then has its unity in mind, but it has other characteristics that seem to depend in some measure upon the body. These characteristics make it quite preposterous to regard the body merely as a machine. If we observe animal behavior, especially the behavior of man, we distinguish certain features which show mental direction and control. We may single out spontaneity, persistence, bringing the action to a stop when the end is achieved, learning by experience, and acting as a

whole. Such behavior can only be understood as the working of a purpose. Personality as we ordinarily know it has two aspects, a mental and a bodily aspect; we know persons as bodies and also as minds. So too purposive behavior has these two aspects.

The philosophy of idealism, quite consistently, undertakes to view the body as the appearance of the reality which is mind. By an easy extension of this view, we arrive at the theory of panpsychism. The external universe is understood as the appearance of the universal mind, the Soul of the Universe. We see Reality, the Absolute, and also one another, as physical nature and physical bodies, but experience ourselves directly as mind; and in the mystic experience we are directly aware of Reality as God.

So far we have considered the author's treatment of the problem of the mind and body in their normal relations, especially certain philosophical theories which undertake to make these relations intelligible. But both mind and body are subject to abnormal conditions; and the author proceeds to deal with these, and to deal with them from an extraordinary wealth of experience. He is open minded and large minded, and what he has to say is highly important. Here again we have theories as to the relation of body and mind in diseased states. We have the materialistic theory that diseases of the body cause diseases of the mind; and on the other hand we have the theory that diseases of the mind cause diseases of the body; or to put it otherwise, diseases of the mind come from diseases of the body, and diseases of the body come from diseases of the mind. Common sense and ordinary experience would seem to justify both of these views, however difficult it may be to justify them in theory. The author very sensibly recognizes and admits some degree of truth in both views. In spite of materialistic arguments, however plausible, he holds steadfastly to the position that diseased conditions of mind cause diseases of the body, and that to cure some diseases of the body we must begin with the mind and use the prin-

ciple of mental healing. He cites facts and cases with which he has had abundant practical experience. His treatment from the point of view of fact and theory is both enlightened and enlightening.

We approach the study of personality through attentive observation of behavior. In behavior, physical and mental functions seem to operate as one whole. Systematic analysis of behavior brings to view a convenient and general distinction between mind and body. Although this is an age-long distinction which has been a matter of common knowledge since Plato, we find to our surprise that when we undertake to make it thoroughly clear to thought, we meet exceedingly baffling situations and complexities. Some of these we have dealt with in the foregoing, with the result that the nature of personality was to be sought in the nature of mind. We saw that purposive behavior means mental direction and control. The next step, therefore, is to consider the nature and structure of the mind.

In purposive behavior the organism acts as a unit; and our problem is to determine how this unity is constituted and maintained. A close study of purposive behavior brings to light two forms of mental activity which are of far reaching importance. Purposive activity which is spontaneous and independent of previous experience we call instinctive. On the other hand, purposive activity may be directed and controlled in the light of previous experience; in other words, by intelligence. These two forms of activity, instinctive and intelligent, make up the body of our purposive life. When we reflect that instinct and intelligence are conscious functions, we see that the problem of consciousness is before us. It is usual to distinguish in a state of consciousness two aspects: the conscious subject, that which is conscious; and the object of the consciousness, that of which we are conscious. This is a very convenient, and certainly a very commonly accepted distinction; but under close inspection it is seen to be rather arbitrary and conventional than necessary or obvious. It is true that in

ordinary experience we do make the distinction both in language and in thought. How and why the distinction was first made is a question which would take us back into prehistoric experience. Probably the first step was to distinguish between one's own body and other bodies; then one's own body was identified with the self, and the self was identified with thought. Thought seems always to have an object; in other words, we always think about something. But Plotinus would teach us, thought in its first intention has itself for its object; or, as we may now say, the first stage of thought is self-consciousness. But apart from the problem of self-consciousness, we seem quite right in making a distinction between immediate and mediate knowledge, relational knowledge. It seems both obvious and safe to say that in immediate knowledge the distinction between subject and object is not made. This conclusion has consequences for a later discussion.

The problem of personality involves a thoroughgoing discussion of the nature of experience, both the subject of experience and the organization of experience. In view of this task, the author emphasizes the importance of a knowledge of the structure of the mind as the basis for understanding the nature of personality. By the way, he remarks that even though we believe in a complete parallelism between mind and body, the study of physiology gives little help, at present, in approaching the structure of the mind, or the nature of personality; and insists that psychological observation is the indispensable and proper method. On the distinction in experience between subject and object, he considers three cases. At this point the author raises fundamental issues. He takes first the case of seeing a set of electric lights. Here, in quite conventional terms, he distinguishes between the act of perceiving and the object perceived. He enters upon questionable and dangerous ground, when he goes on to say that the object, the cluster of electric lights, may be explained as a part of the physical world around us, or that it may be considered as mental, but in

either case we must hold that the visual experience is mental and belongs to the subject. Whether or not the object here is physical or mental is, he says, a question for metaphysics. This is a convenient, and all too common way of disposing of a troublesome question, one which in all fairness should be faced, and if possible answered. In real truth, a great deal depends upon whether we are to hold that the cluster of electric lights is a physical object, a part of the physical world, or that it is mental and belongs to the mind. First of all, we may very properly ask what does it mean to say that an object of vision is physical. If we attempt to give a systematic answer, we either fall into contradiction or into complexities which call for a new metaphysics. If on the other hand we say the object is mental, we take a position which may be consistently held, however common sense may be outraged. This answer does indeed raise the further question as to the real meaning of saying that visual experience belongs to the subject. No doubt, common thought and common usage of speech justifies this form of statement. This is because our experience has gone through ages of organization, and we have found convenient ways of describing it. But take the experience of seeing the electric lights as it is for itself, and without the presuppositions which we use in describing it, and the distinction between subject and object does not appear; there is no distinction between the perceiving and the perceived. What actually happens is that color experience takes place. There is no direct reference in the experience to a subject. The electric lights are color experience; it adds nothing to say that they are experienced. The perceiving is the color experience. Our analysis of "subject perceiving," "the act of perceiving," and "the perceived" is imported from without, not derived from within. We must therefore object to the author's form of analysis, and we shall undertake to make the correction later. His terminology is inappropriate, but this does not vitiate his further discussion. The next case is that of pain in the diseased tooth. Here he is still less

convincing. He tries to make a distinction between "the process of being in pain" and "the pain sensation." A severe toothache is a very absorbing experience and it is safe to say that no one makes such a distinction in the midst of his suffering. His suffering is his being. We may well say, he is the ache. He may, of course, if he becomes reflective, say I ache; but he does this on the basis of recalling other experiences; he makes use of history. The metaphysics of a case like this is apt to lead to solipsism; but solipsism cannot be avoided by making premature and arbitrary distinctions.

The next is a case of mathematical experience, and is one of peculiar interest and importance. In geometrical proof, we are said to make a distinction between the process of thinking and what we are thinking about, the thinking and the geometrical truth which we think. For example, we think through the Pythagorean proposition, and then we are said to be in possession of the truth that the square described on the hypothenuse of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares on the other two sides. This truth, we may think about, make an object of thought, but we do not refer it to the physical world, or give it a place among physical objects. We may express it in a proposition, or represent it by a diagram, but the truth itself lies in the meaning of the proposition or diagram: it is in the mind of the one who sees it. This seems clear and is the commonly accepted doctrine. But the author's further contention that in this experience a distinction is made between the thinking and the truth is both ambiguous and questionable. It is true that we do think about this geometrical truth, make it an object of thought; but we do this on the basis of distinctions already established in the general course of our experience, not on the basis of a distinction that is obvious in the experience itself. At the moment, and apart from the act of reflection, we make no such distinction, we *are* the thought; in the experience as such the thinking and the thought are one. The fact is, in ordinary

speech, the word "thought" is used ambiguously, now for the thinking and again for the thing thought. This ambiguity runs through all languages when the action and the result of the action are involved. The word "creation" is a beautiful instance; it may mean the act, the process of creation, or it may mean the result of the act, the created universe. This may be taken as an instinctive recognition in immediate experience of the oneness of consciousness and its supposed object; or of the traditional and conventional subject and object. The author's selection of the mathematical case is specially significant, for the reason that the whole body of mathematics is a system of thought wherein physical objects have no place, but serve as mere symbols, as do a, b, c, and x, y, z, in algebra. It is a cardinal illustration of the nature of thought as perception of relations and as a distinction-making process. But, as in the philosophy of Plotinus, the distinctions are made by and out of the body of the "One." In other words, in the language of Bertrand Russell, all mathematics is of the form, p implies q; that is, the infinite details of the science of mathematics develop from and by the single simple principle of inference. This leads to a peculiar insight into the nature of experience, and into the nature of science; namely, that experience is one whole, and that science is one function of that whole. We have no hesitation in saying that science is one consistent whole, or aims to be; and the principle of consistency, if followed rigorously, leads to the conclusion that in reality experience is a systematic whole, in spite of the distinctions and divisions we make in it. This metaphysical unity corresponds to the psychological unity of consciousness, which is implied in referring the various states of consciousness to one source, as we do when we use "I."

Various attempts have been made to explain what we call the unity of consciousness. The author states and contrasts the views of James and Ward, and adopts a form of explanation substantially that of James. The point of the contrast is that for James "thought is born an owner and

dies owned"; that is, each thought as it comes takes up the just previous thought, and gives itself to the next succeeding, and in this way the unity and continuity of experience can be established and maintained. For Ward, on the other hand, the unity lies in the identity of the subject, whose only function is to be the subject of experience, to be that which thinks, etc. The author substitutes the word "experience" for James's word "thought," and says that it is the successive acts of attention that are linked. This is another way of saying that the unity is established through memory.

All this discussion relates to the nature of the mind as subject of experience, and to its changing states. We are now to follow the author in his account of the organization of the mind. In this account, the organization of the mind involves certain elementary factors which are combined to constitute the working mind. He recalls the distinction previously made between the instinctive activities and those developed and directed by intelligence. The first task is to determine what are the instinctive tendencies of the mind. Here the author borrows William McDougall's table of the fourteen instincts with their corresponding emotions, and refers to his theory as to the relation between instinct and emotion. Instinct is an inherited and original tendency to act in a given way in response to stimuli; emotion is the consciousness that accompanies the action. With these primitive instincts and emotions the organization of the mind begins. Emotions combine and become centered about some idea in the form of sentiments. With the development of experience, sentiments appear of higher and more complex grades. According to this scheme, love and hate are sentiments, sentiments that are combined with special interests. In this way, we may picture the mind as a structure of successive levels culminating in one towering interest, to which all other interests are subordinated. It is of special significance to the New-Churchman that at this point the author introduces the word "love" in the sense of an all-comprehensive and all-satisfying interest. He men-

tions as examples, love of truth, love of goodness, love of God, love of power, love of gain, love of self. Putting these together and adding the various kinds and forms of love indefinitely, we get the love of the universe as a whole and all things in it. This conclusion, though natural and inevitable, and one which the author does not glimpse, really involves a fundamental change in the point of view, and a complete revolution in our interpretation of experience and its organization. Professor McDougall treats the love of self as the "master sentiment" which reinforces and controls all other sentiments. This is a correct analysis of self-love and of a selfish life; but if we consider rationalized, moralized, and spiritualized love, self-love is seen to be subordinate and subsidiary. Love is more than complicated organized sentiment; it is motive, and purposive, constitutive; it pursues a purpose and seeks an end, an end which it constitutes. Love is activity; for example, the love of hunting, when complete, is the act of hunting, with all the atmosphere, emotions, desires, ideas, thoughts, and energies that go with it. Love is more than desire and passion; it is also accomplishment; it is satisfied only in achievement. The love of doing includes the doing. Love is life in its whole range. Love is conjunction and impartation; it conjoins husband and wife, parent and child, brothers and sisters, friend with friend, individual with the community, citizen and state, man and humanity; it imparts joy, happiness, and blessedness. The love of knowledge creates science. The love of truth, goodness, and beauty leads to the fulfilment of man's highest ideals, and constitutes his complete life. Love is creative; it creates its own ends and its own objects. Just as the hierarchy of ends implies a supreme end, so the hierarchy of loves implies a supreme love. Loves are more and more comprehensive. The supreme love is all comprehensive, and is universal. It is this universal love that creates all mankind and all nature. The thought of Supreme Love, the Creator, gives us the proper idea of God; Love in the supreme sense is just what we mean by God.

But love to be purposive and constitutive must be conscious and intelligent, volitional and effective. But to say that love is sensitive, rational, volitional, and effective, is to say that it is personal. This is certainly true of human love. What we shall say of the lower grades of love remains to be considered. It follows from the nature of love that, if it is personal as man, it is supremely personal as God. This is another way of saying that love in the highest and fullest sense is the Supreme Person, just as love in the human sense and degree is a person in a less complete form. We must look, therefore, to the nature of love for the character of personality, just as we must look to the nature of love for the character of mind. In other words, mind and personality are characters of love; and we must look to the nature of love for the organization of mind.

The problem of the organization of experience has been approached from two diametrically opposite points of view. In the days of Locke and Hume it was approached by way of an analysis of sensations. With sensations as units, the attempt was made to build up the mind on the principle of association. This led to a fruitless atomism. Under the fire of systematic criticism, this attempt was abandoned. More recently, the instinctive, emotional, and volitional functions were taken as a basis for analysis and construction; and we have efforts like those of Professor McDougall which we have just above outlined. In a different direction, following the course of some metaphysicians, careful students, notably Theodore Merz, began with experience as a whole, and followed the processes of successive limitation, discrimination, specification, etc. In this case, we pass from unity to multiplicity, rather than from multiplicity to unity; from the whole to details, rather than from details to the whole.

If we study the nature of love, and observe that particular states emerge from, or are discriminated from and projected by, the more general love, we begin to see the way to thinking of love as the prime source of all the activities of

life. Further reflection shows that these processes of successive discrimination, projection, specification, etc., are characteristic of love; love is precisely this process; and this can be illustrated at any length. The best, and most strictly psychological, illustration, is the operation of love in forming, pursuing, and achieving a purpose. This is the illustration Swedenborg selected to make clear the idea of creation (Economy of the Animal Kingdom, n. 365). Another, and classical, illustration is Aristotle's development of the hierarchy of ends in the case of bridle-making, horsemanship, strategy, and war, in the opening chapter of the "Ethics." He argued that this process led to a supreme end of all human activities. Perhaps a more familiar illustration is that of writing an essay. We begin with a general idea, or theme, and develop this in the form of paragraphs, sentences, phrases, and words. We are passing from the general to the less general, and to the particular. The same is true of speech-making and working out plans. In fact, if we observe closely, we see that this is the order of life; this is the mode in which love operates, and in which its nature is exhibited. Perhaps a still better illustration of this process is music. Music in general expresses itself in numberless melodies, melodies in phrases, and phrases in notes. Observe that the whole melody is in each note; each note is a specification of the melody. Each note gets its musical quality and significance from the melody as a whole.

These illustrations confirm the view that organization of experience in general, and of mind in particular, proceeds from the whole to details and that love is such a process. This view of the nature of love is an extension and systematization of the traditional ideas of love which are found in history and literature; but it is also revolutionary. It makes love the substance of things; or, more precisely, it identifies love with experience itself. We may say that the substance of things is love; but this gives to the word "substance" a new meaning, different from the traditional meaning, the meaning which Aristotle gave it. It is not

substance in the sense of a subject that lies back of the qualities which it is supposed to possess and to exhibit; this notion of substance leads to materialism. Love is the substance of experience in the sense that melody is the substance of the phrases and notes in which the melody is expressed. In other words, love is related to its affections or states as general to particular. It is easy to arrange loves in this order. We may think of God's infinite love, which is subject to no limitations whatsoever; then of His love of the created universe, His love of nature, of the animal kingdom, of the vertebrates, and so on down to the individuals. Or we may take the more familiar case: man's love of knowledge, of science, of mathematics, of geometry, of conic sections, and so on. In all these cases, the love of the more general is expressed in the love of the less general. Each stage gets its meaning from the preceding.

Coming to the organization of mind, we must begin with the fact that love is conscious, conscious of its states and changes, and of the relations between these. This perception of relations is the ground of the development of rationality. This, in general terms, means that love is wise and also powerful. Wisdom and power are functions of the love which is the mind, the man, the personality. This view of the mind and its organization is more in accordance with the recent trend of metaphysics than is that which the author adopts; it is also a further development of the purposive psychology which has taken the place of the traditional faculty psychology. It is significant that voluntaristic metaphysics and even such an outstanding example of idealistic metaphysics as Royce's "The World and the Individual" are really contributions to the metaphysics of love, here outlined.

After the preliminary treatment of the nature of the mind and its organization, the author passes on to a summary of the methods and results of Experimental Psychology. He looks upon experimental psychology not as a new science, but as an improved technique whereby introspection may be

carried on under pre-arranged conditions. In this way more exact results have been obtained as to our sense experience, and to some extent as to the higher mental operations, results which are available for kindred sciences such as education, medicine, philology, aesthetics, and criminology. The author applies the method in a study of the nature of mathematical ability; but the discussion is too technical to be reproduced here.

One of the best features of the book is the discussion of Child Psychology and the Problems of Adolescence. Due emphasis is given to the fact that the child from birth is an exceedingly complicated organism of body and mind. The health and welfare of the organism depend, in great part, especially at first, upon adequate knowledge, watchfulness, and guidance on the part of those intrusted with the care of the child. The aim is to help the child increasingly to live its own life, and gradually to establish principles and form ideals that will secure character, and direct individual progress. We have here a sympathetic, enlightened, and judicious discussion of adolescence, and especially sex education. The keynote is caution, with a proper use of "substitution" and "sublimation." Sex instinct and sex interest are held in abeyance by offering natural outlets for youthful energies, such as games, athletics, out-door studies, etc.; sublimation is a more delicate task, and a more effective method. Ideals of chivalry, interest in social problems, philosophy, and religion, serve to direct the mind to the higher and spiritual aspects of sex life, and help to develop ideals of true marriage. In this atmosphere of thought, feeling, and sentiment, proper and adequate motives will be found for preserving sexual chastity. The contrast between living for others and living for self is strongly urged; the former as leading to a truly human life, and to the highest form of character, a life of communion with God. Religion is a constant feature of the author's treatment of the full development of personality.

Passing on to the chapters on diseased personality, in-

cluding diseases of the body but especially diseases of the mind, we have an illuminating treatment of mental therapeutics, the application of psychology to the cure of diseases, both bodily and mental. The author takes the sensible position that there are diseases which arise from bodily conditions which affect the body directly, but also the mind indirectly; and there are also diseases which arise from mental conditions, and that these also affect the body. Bodily diseases are cured for the most part by physical means, but often more effectively by mental treatment; mental diseases are cured by direct mental treatment. Much importance has been attached to the distinction between functional and organic diseases. The distinction is valid, if not overdone; for function and structure are so closely connected that a disturbance of the one easily passes over to the other; so that the cure of one may also to a greater or less extent affect the other. In general, however, organic diseases are much less amenable to psychological methods than are functional. The psychological methods most used are "suggestion," "hypnosis," and "psycho-analysis." Usually these are more or less combined. Suggestion and hypnosis are closely connected, inasmuch as they both involve some degree of mental detachment or "dissociation." The author tells at length of the application of these methods to the cure of mental diseases, especially hysteria and other forms of mental dissociation. His discussion is well-informed and judicious throughout, critical as well as constructive. His attitude is wholesome, and is supported by a mature philosophy. He is not disturbed by the abnormalities of personality; for him, the normal personality is that which is unified by moral and religious principles. According to his philosophy, religion has nothing to fear from psycho-analysis, but on the contrary finds a natural support in it. The concluding paragraph of this section is characteristic and is well worth quoting. He is meeting the view that religion is an infantile thing; and that psycho-analysis takes a person back to his childhood, to the primitive credulity

and to the trustfulness of the child. His answer does credit to his insight and to his character. He says:

> Surely we can allow for that, and admit there is infantilism in religion as experienced by the ordinary man which stands in the way of his clear religious vision, and yet hold that true religion itself dates back to the earliest years. It is the trustfulness and faith of the young child—call it what you will,—not merely ideomotor action but a direct awareness. The child is aware of something beyond itself even in its earliest years. That may later on through experience be suppressed, and with analysis may come back. I am strongly against any criticism of psycho-analysis from the point of view of the risk of endangering religious belief. When carried out by inexperienced or otherwise unsuitable people, there may be some danger; but if carried out with due regard to the needs of the situation, there is none.

The rest of the book, eight chapters, is devoted to the consideration of the moral and religious constitution of personality. Ever since Socrates, philosophers have sought to analyze the moral life and reduce it to some one principle, which is to be considered the leading characteristic; but as a matter of fact the moral life is an exceedingly complicated structure, and involves the whole personality. Socrates pursued the question, "What is virtue?", with the aim to define the common character of all virtuous actions which makes them to be virtuous. He came to the conclusion that no action could be virtuous without knowledge; so he put his conclusion in the form "Virtue is knowledge," and supported his conclusion by observing that when men know the consequences of their actions they choose the good in preference to the bad. This is, of course, the principle by which we justify our public school system. Plato dealt more fully with the complications of the moral life, and identified it with justice, the life of a well-ordered state, where all functions and interests are harmonized, and where the benefits of the state are rightly distributed. Aristotle attempted to define virtue in terms of the supreme end, the end which all men aim at; that is, in terms of the good. He saw that men seek good in happiness, and that they are

happy when they enjoy the free exercise of all their faculties, especially the faculty of contemplating the truth. Aristotle's conclusion, therefore, was that virtue is wisdom.

Our author approaches the subject from the psychological point of view. He recognizes the importance of knowledge and intelligence, but emphasizes the sentiments, emotions, and volitions as fundamental factors in moral judgment and action. He maintains that the importance of a given course of conduct is estimated by the whole personality; and so, too, levels of importance. Moral feeling and moral sentiment are expressed in our judgments of value; and our consciousness of higher values comes with the more complete organization of experience. The moral purpose may be summarized in the form, "Seek always the Highest Good." Experience teaches us that our highest good is realized in helping others to attain the greater possibilities of personality. The author has an interesting and significant note on the likeness of morals to music. They are both generalized emotions which tend to develop into details. The history of moral philosophy is a puzzling undertaking. As so well exemplified by Kant, it tends to run off into empty abstractions; and for this reason books on moral philosophy are dry reading. The author is quite justified in placing the emphasis on the concrete and complex life. The characteristic of the moral life is the pursuit of purpose and the selection of ends. This points to love as the function which constructs ends and fulfils purposes. So that the organization of ends proceeds with the exercise of more and more comprehensive love.

At this point the author turns aside to make a penetrating summary and criticism of Bergson's philosophy of change, under the head of "Personality and Evolution." But to enter into the merits of his treatment would take us beyond our present limits.

The final section of the book is a good summary of the author's philosophy of religion. It must be said, with disappointment and surprise, that it moves towards univer-

salism rather than towards Christianity. There is much wholesome discussion of psychology and ethics, and of religion in general. God is thought of as the Absolute, Ultimate Reality, the Totality of Things, the Spirit of the Universe; he is said to be the One Complete Person, but personality is universal, not individual. The book is important and helpful, but not satisfying. It is thoughtful, fresh, and mature. It is one of the really good books of the day.

Lewis F. Hite.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE NEW AGE AND THE NEW CHURCH

The general subject of the lectures at the recent meeting of the Fryeburg New-Church Assembly was "A New Church for a New Age." Among the aspects of the subject presented were the Bible, the Interpretation of Its Spiritual Meaning, Swedenborg, and the Modern World. A thoughtful and suggestive attempt was made to specify the characteristics of the New Age. The general effect of the discussions was to impress the importance of developing more fully our knowledge and understanding of the facts and principles on which an adequate presentation of the subjects must rest.

General ideas of the New Age and the New Church are so familiar among us that we are disposed to be satisfied with what we know, to infer what we are interested to claim, and to assume that we are in agreement as to our understanding and interpretations of these general ideas.

A glance at our history, or a survey of the opinions current among us, would show that there are wide divergences both as to what we have in mind when we speak of the New Age and as to what we mean by the New Church. It is aside from our present purpose to rehearse these differences, but some attempt to specify the leading characteristics of the age in which we live and to develop somewhat our general idea of the Church should be profitable.

The idea that we are living in a New Age is widely held and often exultantly expressed. It is easy enough to point to many features of the modern world which are strikingly and significantly new. As the most conspicuous, we turn to the achievements of modern science and its mechanical applications. Examples are ready at hand: flying machines, automobiles, telephones, radiophones, wireless telegraphy, all of them marvelous scientific and mechanical achievements. Me-

chanical improvements and the feats of engineering are almost innumerable and are everywhere present. In the field of the abstract and special sciences, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy, biology, recent advances both in discovery and in theory may well be said to constitute a new age. Archaeology and anthropology have extended our knowledge of human history and human nature. In psychology, the depths of personality have been probed by hypnosis and psycho-analysis, and the results have been made available for curing mental diseases of hitherto the most mysterious and baffling kind. The development of historical method and historical criticism has gone far to make history a new science. In the field of business and industry, improved method and machinery, the tremendous growth of corporations, the increase of wealth, the world-wide extension of the means of transportation and of distributing information, have revolutionized the energies of men and have so transformed international relations that the peoples of the earth are almost next-door neighbors. In the League of Nations, we have an instrumentality for bringing all nations together at a conference table, where they may talk over their common problems and interests from a world point of view. All these features of scientific, industrial, and material progress are so impressive that the public mind has been charged with an atmosphere of admiration and confidence such that we may well say that science is the spirit of the age, and that the new age is the age of science pre-eminently. The important part science has played in history, and especially in the life of today, has led to an extraordinary glorification and hypostatization which too commonly makes science really an object of worship. As a result, the scientific spirit and method have acquired a dominance in every walk of life and in every department of thought.

But there are other features of the age which are deemed even more characteristic. The general improvement in the ordinary circumstances of living, what is called the rise of the scale of living, is more or less prominent in any reference to

the new age. It is new that people of ordinary circumstances enjoy comforts and conveniences which were formerly denied to even the wealthy. Farmers and working men now have automobiles, radiophones, sewing machines, and various labor-saving implements. In the field of mind and spirit, books, magazines, newspapers, kodaks and pictures, the public school system from kindergarten to university, advantages of travel, give easy and common access to all fields of knowledge and opportunities for cultivating tastes. Democratic ideas, institutions, methods, and habits tend to equalize opportunities and conditions of life, and to secure political and governmental control to the common body of citizens. Interest in general human welfare has stimulated various directions of humanitarian effort, with institutions to care for the sick, the infirm, the disabled, and the unfortunate. With this goes the great advance of medicine and surgery.

In view of all these lines of progress and advanced achievement, we have abundant reason for acclaiming the New Age. All these conditions offer unexampled and unprecedented opportunities for improving human life on all levels and in every department. We are sure and happy that we are living in a new age.

The important question is, are we making the most of our opportunities? It seems to be one of the constant weaknesses of human nature to neglect and abuse opportunities. History is replete with object lessons to this effect; abuses seem to go with improvements and opportunities. So much is this the case that looking back through history it is difficult to observe any general progress of mankind from age to age. In some respects, there has been, as we have abundantly shown, wonderful progress; but in others the progress is not so obvious. The really important question is, has there been progress in intelligence, wisdom, and virtue; in intellectual ability and moral integrity? Are we sure that people now do more nearly as they know than they did in former ages? It is doubtful whether there has been any progress in intellectual and artistic ability since the days of Greek philosophy, Greek art, and

Greek letters, although it may be that such ability is more widely distributed. It is a question whether there has been any progress in personal and civic virtue since the palmy days of Roman history. The flowering of literary genius in the age of Louis XIV of France, Queen Elizabeth of England, Goethe and Schiller in Germany, has not been surpassed in modern times. Plotinus, Leibniz, and Berkeley are companions on even terms with F. H. Bradley and Josiah Royce. Modern philosophy, the philosophy of our day, is a wonderful achievement, but it is built on the work of the old masters. Plato and Aristotle are still the princes of the age.

Such reflections should make us pause in vaunting the supremacy of our age. Further analysis would seem to give us grounds for yet more serious reflections. Miss Helen Keller has ventured to make the observation that people at the present day are averse to thinking. Much the same assertion has been made by others. It may be that the business of life has been so mechanized that the mind itself has become mechanical in its habits. When a man is steering an automobile, his mind is intent on his wheel and on the road. Any distraction may be fatal. He cannot indulge in concentrated thought, as the man who is walking with ease and comfort along a country pathway, or is riding on horseback. The man who is at his task in the machine shop cannot let his mind wander, as can the shoemaker at his last, or the farmer at his plow, or the carpenter at his bench. Perhaps this goes to explain why great men, men capable of original thought, are so often from the country. The speed and concentration of machine work do not allow the same play of fancy and meditation, as life in the fields or in the leisurely employments of the olden days. The struggle for existence now is not so much a struggle for food and clothing and shelter as a struggle directly for wages; and the struggle for wages is a struggle to keep one's place in the shop and at the automatic lathe. The pressure of mechanical employment seems to have had its effect on the habits of mind, and made the intimate and complex operations of thought distasteful and uncongenial. This may explain why the bankers opposed the Federal Reserve System; they had not the

free imagination nor the power to think outside of accustomed grooves. It is a matter of common observation that ideas and methods of reform come from outside, not from within the industry reformed. This seems to be recognized in the policy of setting up great laboratories and scientific schools to train men in inventive originality and in abstract science.

Again, the modern reading habit is a constant and fruitful source of superficiality of mind. Many people seem to get their political opinions from newspaper headlines, and thereby become victims of propaganda. But even when they do more than read the headlines, the hurried glance at the news of the day on the subway trains leaves no opportunity for putting things together and thinking out the causes and consequences of the events described. As a result, the reading public is more or less at the mercy of the interested parties who manufactur and manipulate the news to their purpose.

The reading of books and magazines is little better, indeed in some respects worse; little better as a stimulus to close and clear thinking, worse in positive moral and intellectual injury. The avalanche of books that flows forth year by year from the press in the form of fiction is enormous. In addition to this, we have the paper stands loaded with magazines. If any one will take a sample of these books and magazines that flood the public, he will be dismayed at the thought that young people are brought up on this mental diet. There are, indeed, in almost equal volume, books on philosophy, science, history and literature; but taking the whole output into consideration, it is a rare exception that you find a really good book, a book written by a well informed, highly developed mind. Most of this mass is worse than literary trash; it is imbecillic and vicious, where it is not commonplace. The same may be said of the magazine articles. It is true that there are some good books and some good magazine articles; but comparatively few people see them, and most people would probably not take the trouble or make the effort to read them, if they had the opportunity. The picture is a sad one, but it needs to be recognized as a feature of the new age, and it helps to explain why people do not think, why they are sat-

isfied to swim along in the intellectual and emotional current, taking the sentiments and ideas as they come, not caring for either quality or significance.

This passive and indolent habit of mind is perhaps a still more serious matter than superficiality. One disastrous effect is that it exposes the public mind to the propaganda of all sorts of organized interests. Advertising is of course a legitimate way of reaching the public, when confined within the limits of truth; and the line between advertising and systematic propaganda is often hard to draw; but this does not relieve the odium of the propaganda when it is used for exploitation.

Of the various extensive forms, it seems that political and scientific propaganda are those which most involve the public welfare. Never in the history of the world have the agencies of propaganda been so extensive, so well equipped, and so powerful. The printing press, the atmosphere of publicity, and ordinary social intercourse are combined, controlled, and operated in the interest of organized business. The printing of books, magazines, and newspapers is in itself an amazing business and is connected with other business enterprises large and small. Inasmuch as all forms of business activity converge directly or indirectly in the great financial centers, the body of concentrated monied interests finds inevitable expression in the business of printing, and exercises undue control of it. The consequence is that in spite of sporadic efforts at free expression, the press is helplessly subject to the dictation of organized interests, and money value is prevailingly the final criterion of literary and intellectual excellence. This is what opens the way to the immoralities of printed matter, and of the stage as well. Under the circumstances, it is the newspapers that are the most effective means of propaganda; they are the chief means of publicity, and when directed with a purpose they can create an atmosphere of sentiment and opinion which may possess, or obsess, the public mind. The publication of a great newspaper like the *New York Times* involves an outlay of millions of dollars. Its success depends upon the favor of its advertisers. It must succeed or fail as

a business; and as a business it has the same interests as other forms of business and is bound by them, especially by the interests of the financial centers. It must bow to these interests and speak for them, as for its own life. This situation is repeated in the case of every newspaper, whether great or small, and the result is that the newspapers of the land must interpret the welfare of the community in terms dictated by the interests which control them. They are not free to do otherwise. The same is true of the great body of magazines.

By these conditions the welfare of the community is imperiled. Large business enterprises have an interest, and an entirely legitimate one, in government and legislation; but they may and do combine to direct and control legislation. Such enormous business organizations as the United States Steel Corporation, the General Motors, the International Harvester Company, the Standard Oil Company, and others, combine to exert through the newspapers and otherwise a pressure upon public opinion and through public opinion upon the government which is constant and tremendous. Through this moulding of public opinion political leaders are created, and the results of elections are determined. We extol the importance of freedom, and proclaim our freedom of the press, freedom of the ballot, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought; but if we look into the actual conditions, we begin to realize the sobering fact that in the proper sense we have neither free press nor free ballot. The press is used to manipulate public opinion and to create an atmosphere of political thought and sentiment in which it is next to impossible to see men and events as they really are. Only by exhaustive investigations can the citizen and voter reach conclusions based upon the relevant facts and free from the effects of systematic propaganda. Under this blinding and misleading propaganda, it may be truly said that with too little exception thought is not free, the ballot is not free, our political life is not free. Such freedom of the press and of the ballot as we have is hardly more than a pretense or a vain profession.

In view of these conditions, we should recognize that democracy—which depends upon the virtue and intelligence of

the people, and upon free thought, free speech, and free ballot—must be a sham and a farce, merely a tool of plutocracy. These are not temporary or local conditions; they are constant conditions wherever the increase of population brings into existence large and varied forms of business and large accumulations of capital. Economic interests and organization then become dominant. Industry and even social and private life pass over to the control of organized bodies. All forms of government, whether in name democratic or not, become subject to plutocratic dominion. The modern world is becoming more and more a life of organized industry, of organized economic interests, and of plutocratic government and administration. The individual is little more than a wage slave, and the citizen a political tool. Freedom is the choice between one's place in the system and starvation. Probably, from one-fourth to one-third of the population of the earth at the present time is living on the verge of starvation. In this country, supposed to be the most favored on earth, if we count the unemployed, those who are living on wages barely sufficient to afford subsistence, and those who are in a constant state of uncertainty as to holding their positions, the proportion is about one-fifth; that is, taking the country over, every fifth person is living on the verge of starvation. This is due partly to increase of population, partly to human weakness, largely, possibly, to the present organization of business. However that may be, the situation is a sad commentary on the character of the age, and one which the new age should find incongruous and intolerable. The deadening effects of perverted industrialism and sinister propaganda are too plainly exhibited in weakened and lower mentality not to be observed as disturbing features of the age.

Certain psychological specialists tell us that the average intellectual ability of the men and women of the present day is about that of children fourteen years old. This is surprising, if not questionable; but if true, it would be a staggering indictment of the new age, and especially of our education. It is generally felt and asserted that our educational system does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of a rational and moral

standard. The complaint is that our school system is too mechanical and that it turns out a mechanical product. Young people are shaped after the same pattern and into the same mould. Tastes, aptitudes, and interests are not stimulated and developed. The young graduate too often finds himself at sea in the world where he should be more at home because of his education. Recent experiments recognize this.

This challenge of our education involves the work of science and of the scientific spirit. We have seen that the outstanding claim of the new age is that it is the age of the new and advanced science. If we analyze conditions closely, we find a striking and significant parallel between the world of practical life and the world of scientific interests. We saw that the amazing development of machinery and the enormous extension of industrial and financial organization were distinctive marks of the New Age. Preoccupation with machinery seemed to induce mechanical habits of mind, while the power of combined business organizations extended to all the concerns of daily life, whether mental, social, or practical. We observed that this power, whether naturally or deliberately, was exerted through agencies of propaganda, such as the press, social contact and influence, and the atmosphere created by the largeness and pervasiveness of business interests. We found that such all-embracing forces of propaganda were an ominous and perversive characteristic of the age.

In the field of scientific interests we have similar conditions. We have strong and dominating personalities, organization of knowledge and research in the special sciences; we have scientific tradition and scientific dogma; we have the great body of the public and of teachers and students. The business of teaching proceeds on the basis of the relation of master to disciple. Lectures, text books, articles in magazines and newspapers, essays and special treatises, private conversation and public discussion, all these are ways of conveying science from the sources to the recipients. In this proceeding, every man is presumably free to make his own observations and do his own thinking, free also to take what is handed down to him with due criticism and with due reference to original sources. But

as usual the middle men in the series do most of the work of distribution; they are the great body of science teachers. It is here that the machinery for propaganda develops. These science teachers are for the most part specialists, and are interested in their several departments. They take the science that is given them, and work in traditional and professional grooves. They are seldom interested to question the presuppositions of their science, or to examine critically the methods and results that are handed down from the recognized authorities. Even when they carry on their investigations in the laboratory, the accepted results of science in general are received without question, and they devote themselves to some special problem which has to do with technical outposts. Books, magazine articles, and the newspapers rehearse what the prominent men say and so pass it on to the reading public. All this is natural and inevitable, but in the meantime science and the scientist acquire and assume an authoritative character and function. In the natural and proper course of transmission, a pernicious form of propaganda is set going. Scientific theories, dogmas, results, methods, observations, conclusions, traditions, pass through this propagating machinery with increasing momentum, and the recipients become more and more passive. Under the spell of this propaganda, what the scientist says is what Science says; and the authority of Science is final. Under this spell, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of teaching are in the same position as in the field of political propaganda; they are subject to the requirement that you must think, speak, and teach according to the accepted and assured pronouncements of science, that is of the scientists. No doubt freedom is the real and true aim of ideal science, and some men of science cherish and strive after it. But in large part the so-called scientific freedom is fictitious, because of the fact that it is bound by the effects of propaganda. This is exemplified by the history of science, especially by the history and present status of the doctrine of evolution, where the formula is "Every well informed man knows and believes that evolution is a fact". One who declines to admit the fact and questions the grounds of the belief puts himself *ipso facto*

outside the pale of educated men. This is the kind of intolerance, narrow-mindedness and bigotry that the propaganda imposes upon the men of our day.

All these forms of propaganda are inevitable, as inevitable as are their consequences; they are incident to the weaknesses and perversities of human nature, more properly unregenerate human nature; they deprive men of freedom, and lower the levels of moral and intellectual integrity: they are to an extraordinary degree characteristic of our age.

This glance at the New Age is rapid and incomplete. The age has another aspect which is even more important, the moral and spiritual aspect. But a treatment of this aspect must be reserved for another occasion. We need to consider the New Age specifically in relation to the New Church. This is reserved for the next issue of the REVIEW.

LEWIS F. HITE.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

We do not mean to discuss the relations of these two with the least pretension to fulness; only to make a single point that is not often pressed.

That is, there is a deep-lying ambiguity in the world, and in the world to which science addresses itself, which makes room for the ventures and the faith of religion.

There has never been a time when two observers, surveying the world before them, could not make very different reports on its meaning. The time has never been when two observers did not return conflicting reports about it. They looked on the same things. They had the same phenomena before them. Yet they came to divergent if not opposite conclusions as to the import of it all. When the Psalm-writer exclaimed,

> "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork,"

so they did to him. Doubtless then as now the majority of men could not at least witness to any lively sensations on that. Men a-plenty who also considered the heavens and the stars, but could not honestly feel impressed by anything beyond. To

them the heavenly host did not spell God. And so the force of observation has varied always. Brother Lawrence could be struck of a sudden by the renewed life of the trees after a winter of seeming death, and have a conviction sweep him there was a God Who perpetually holds His world in existence. But springtime had come and gone in his life many times without the experience. About as readily Rousseau was urged by the Lisbon earthquake to think Providence an unreality. Swedenborg contemplated the co-operative life of a colony of bees, and felt that in that altruistic society he had an assurance of a Creator of infinite love. John Stuart Mill took note how one form of life preys on another on land and in the seas, and questioned that behind such unfeeling war between creatures there could be a feeling Creator. Indeed, it does not take two men to return these conflicting reports. One observer brings back conflicting evidences in the world for and against the spiritual realities. Any one mind can be alive to these *pros* and *cons* of the observable world. A contemporary poet writes:

> God, I return to You on April days
> When along country roads You walk with me,
> And my faith blossoms like the earliest tree
> That shames the bleak world with its yellow sprays—
> My faith revives, when through a rosy haze
> The clover-sprinkled hills smile quietly,
> Young winds uplift a bird's clean ecstacy . . .
> For this, O God, my joyousness and praise!
> But now—the crowded streets and choking airs,
> The squalid people, bruised and tossed about;
> These, or the over-brilliant thorough-fares,
> The too-loud laughter and the empty shout,
> The mirth-mad city, tragic with its cares . . .
> For this, O God, my silence—and my doubt.

This ambiguity is present in the world of observation. No point-blank and uncontested witness is to be extracted from it to any of the possible higher realities of our existence. We are talking of the force of things to sheer observation. When you try hypotheses, suggestions of the spirit, systematic interpretations of phenomena, you may begin to reduce the con-

testing phenomena to a fine and hopeful unity, but just to observation there are things *pro* and *con* on the great issues. So the Seer gives up the entrance on the things of the spirit by way of processes of externally gathered knowledge, and says that from things to be observed in nature (and doubtless elsewhere) one can confirm himself, according to the exercise of higher mental powers or spiritual, in favor of or against a God, etc. The ambiguity, like nature, is impersonal, and exists for good and bad.

Look for indications in the observable world around us of an unseen wise Guidance of the affairs of men. Men come to great power who seem to us there quite plainly under Providence; but again powerful leaders of bad projects succeed, too. If great men are raised up to deal with large issues, they are also struck down. Now history seems to disclose a Divine hand; then, in a whirlwind of passion and slaughter, it seems to be in anything but Divine hands. And this ambiguity exists with a poignant force for the good man, and the man ready to see a wise and beneficent hand in things. The indifferent man, and the man of evil intention, makes nothing of the ambiguity. With what mingled testimony history, the conditions of society, even nature speaks to the idea of Providence. The world is not silent on the spiritual issues. It is for, and it is against.

We may be allowed to press the point further. We do not leave this ambiguity behind by going to the best things the world holds. For it is this ambiguous world which still holds them. Turn to that supreme treasure, any articulate expression of the Word of God in a literature. Conditions in the world and the conditions of human life assert themselves on it. Not only are there diverse literatures which purport to speak the Word of God, to Buddhist, to Mahometan, to the Christian. Within that one literature with which our civilization has to do, the Bible, men find enough to make them think it is the Word of God, and enough to make them think it is not. Primitive moral standards are imbedded in it which are no guidance now. Ways of conceiving God are put forward, and in God's name, which are impossible to us now. Yet there

is a revelation of God in it, especially in the life and Person of the Master, which is bound to command the reverence of the human mind. There are moral ideals, their beauty and intrinsic good undeniable, which are far up the road ahead of the race, indefinitely to guide mankind. There is so much that is plainly more than human, and the inspiration of God. There is so much that is untoward, and the reflection of human slowness and incapacity. Of course there is an explanation of all this; but aside from the fact that explanation has its limits on the Scriptures as on life and the world, we are talking of the stock which observation takes of Scripture.

There are men and women of religion who feel that they must combat this notion that the world is at all so ambiguous about the highest realities. Some do so on the strength of their own certainties of religious experience. But these certainties of their inner life are not to be found in the outer world. They overlook that. To the Psalmist himself the world was not articulate with the idea of God; there was no speech or language; the thought that rose in him was echoed by the world. But whatever we feel prompted to do, religious insight at its best seems not to have quarreled with a recognition of the world's indecisiveness about the great realities. Religious insight has not been prompted to deny this ambiguity. It has not even wished the fact otherwise. It has welcomed the fact. Indeed it has regarded the inconclusiveness of the world on the highest issues of our life as its own chance for existence. That ambiguous testimony in the realm of fact has thrown open the gate into the world of faith. A world of no point-blank testimony to the eternal verities is the only environment, after all, in which faith, reasoned, and freely ventured, can grow. Suppose you and I were confronted with ungainsayable evidence in the region of the observable (with eye or mind) that God there is, that His path for us lies precisely here, or there, and that just so His Word runs, there would go out of life such things as interpretation, decision, insight, faith, moral agency, yes, character. The world is in the Divine purpose the ambiguous thing it is for the highest decisions and issues in life. Religious insight at

its best makes no bones about it. It uses such language as this which I quote from an honored teacher in our church:

> It is one of the conditions essential to the fitness of this world for the abode of man, that the hand of the Lord be not too evident in it. It is enough that it is here, and visible by all who care to look for it; if it were too plainly seen to be all-powerful, and controlling every event of life, a dull fatalism would paralyse human effort, and make intelligent, joyful co-operation with the Divine impossible. ("Lectures," John Worcester, p. 65.)

Now, is this not something to take into account in any thought of the relations of science and religion to each other?

Science, observing the ambiguous world for its part, is bound not to know about the eternal verities. It is bound to be agnostic. Its order of information does not emerge from the ambiguities. Of the scientific order of knowledge, there is no knowledge to be had of God, or His presence in things, or His aims, or His utterances. These are not realities in the scope of science's observations. What the religious man might take for evidences of such realities are accompanied in science's accumulations by what the indifferent or the irreligious can seize on as evidence of no such realities. Science is itself a part of the spiritually ambiguous world. Its findings can be quoted in favor of the conviction that God there is; much else it tells us seems to offer plenty of people difficulty with the thought that God there can be. What to-day, with an increasingly telling force, science has to say of a long and complicated process of evolution by which all things came to be, this to some helps with the clearer thought of God, and of a God of infinite power and inconceivable patience. But to others, and to sincerely religious souls, it seems to say still more loudly that there is no God. All the time science itself rests with a description of the process; of what that process portends religiously, or of the Power, if any, that drives it, it does not profess to know; it takes itself to be in the region of a world reticent as to that.

Now religion, while it proffers knowledge here, does not, on the other hand profess to add the kind of knowledge which science cannot attain to. It comes into our thought and ob-

servation with something more than this order of information. And I take it that when Swedenborg says that the things of faith are not to be climbed up into from the things of the senses, or by force of the acquisition of facts, that he means that religion inevitably comes with something more than knowledge. Religion has a world of its own. It does not set science right. That is the business of ever better posted and based science. It does not even supplement what it might feel to be science's shortcoming, not in the latter's field. Within the ambiguities of the world of common observation and of science, it takes a man into a world of faith, and of the spirit's insight. This insight and faith are as much fact as observation is. Their world is as much reality as is the world of observation—at least. But the order of knowledge is of another sort. It is all cradled in faith. As we know one another ordinarily, all who had any contact with Jesus Christ in Palestine knew Him. They could describe Him to the authorities. When He came down the road, they recognized Him, and crowded the place. But there was a knowledge beyond theirs which a few came to have. These took Him for what He held Himself out to be. In that faith in Him they knew Him as the first and ordinary acquaintances did not and could not. The best knowledge of Him came in faith in Him. It was conditioned on faith in Him. It had to wait for faith in Him. So we find Him telling these "blessed" not to make Him known. They would only be trying to make information of what had to be insight. They should not do it. The truth was to be held in the realm of insight. We do not learn the lesson well. We offer knowledge, downright, ungainsayable knowledge, where the truth is a knowledge cradled in faith. Of the process by which things came to be, religion has no better knowledge of the same sort to give than science makes out. But in science's best report of that process, as in its less competent ones in the past, religion can see the hand of the Creator, and know that by such a process after all only His powers could be effective.

But to add an illustration of the point. In the broad use of the word, we have much knowledge of the world of the spirit.

There is no reason why the New-Churchman should not say that he knows that the world of the spirit is actually a world, with objects in it, and human activities, and all the outward seeming of a world, too; but he will not suppose that this is outwardly garnered knowledge of the sort he can have of hills and people and events. It is a different order of knowledge. It is had and held in a faith that there is another world. It is had and held in the faith that God there is, and that He has deigned to make known some things about that world. It is "revealed" knowledge, as we say, knowledge imbedded in a great faith, the faith that God there is, and that He speaks to men. It is not for us a knowledge gathered from our observation of such a world, nor collected by the processes of learning.

It is out of order then to press religion for a proof and an order of knowledge which is science's. It is also the demeaning of religion to affect that it gives men a knowledge not suspended in faith's reasoned approaches to spiritual reality.

Of the mind born of religion it can always be said, "Out of Egypt have I called my son". There are repeated instances of this emigration in the Scriptures. In the pioneer days of the Old Testament Abraham moves up out of Egypt into Canaan. Later the whole people descended from him makes the same exodus. The prophets of Israel never forget the event. Even the Master as a Babe is carried into Egypt, and makes the journey up into Palestine, and gives the highest reference of all to the words, "Out of Egypt have I called My Son". In this historic movement Scripture has symbolized the human mind's perpetual movement out of the world of fact and knowledge and the learning processes into the region of interpretation and insight into unseen verities. The religious mind has a stage of development which belongs in the first world, and a side of its continued existence which belongs in that world. But it is not tied to the world of knowledge. It is restive even with a knowledge, if it is the mere knowing about them, about the very things of the spirit. It presses on to a realizing sense of those things. The best formulated ideas of God, the truest information to be had about Him, religion's own science and

body of information, this is not enough. Not to the spirit of religion. It wants to penetrate through all that body of things that can be told, to a sense of the Divine Being, to a confidence in Providence, to an assurance of immortality which is not logic, or "facts", but the heart's confidence, and ineffable. Religion is not going to trouble about ambiguity of intent in a realm out of which it is going to summon the spirit born of it anyway.

To religious thought and insight, therefore, the ambiguity on spiritual issue and reality, of the world open to observation, is a welcome enough fact. That makes a chance for the venture of faith. It is an argument for something beyond. It urges to a higher insight. It invites the whole man, aspirations, moral freedom, attraction to an ideal, to express himself, not just the mental faculties that would love to have a "sign" and go by the facts only. One is thrown not on external knowledge then; one is bound to keep up the quest until one rests in Him Who has made us all for Himself. The ambiguity in the world on our final questions and highest needs is of His doing, and of His wise contriving. It seems to be the very daring of Infinite Love. Has not Edwin Markham caught this beautifully, and put it stirringly in the words:

"When in the dim beginning of the years,
God mixed in man the raptures and the tears
And scattered through his brain the starry stuff,
He said, "Behold! Yet this is not enough,
For I must test his spirit to make sure
That he can dare the vision and endure.

"I will withdraw My face,
Veil Me in the shadow for a certain space,
And leave behind only a broken clue,
A crevice where the glory glimmers through,
Some whisper from the sky,
Some footprints in the road to track Me by.

"I will leave man to make the fateful guess,
Will leave him torn between the no and yes,
Leave him unresting till he rests in Me,
Drawn upward by the choice that makes him free—.
Leave him in tragic loneliness to choose,
With all in life to win or all to lose."

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

SPIRITUAL CAPTIVITY

A Study in Serial Interpretation of the Word

The books of the Word contain a spiritual sense. We all accept that premise. The Scriptures are full of meaning for the conduct of life, meaning that tells of the growth of the human spirit into the image and likeness of God. But there are various ways of coming upon this deeper meaning. One may seek to understand and appreciate the meaning of one word or phrase of Scripture. And again, with a knowledge of the meaning of the word, he may seek to know the relation that meaning bears to the longer passage; to the chapter, to the book, even to the whole Word.

Take the word water, for instance. Water cleanses; so does truth. Water cleanses material objects; that is one of its functions. Truth cleanses the mind of falsity; that is one of its functions. We say water corresponds to truth; we say it, if our effort is to appreciate the meaning of one single word of Scripture.

But in a larger sense, to say that water corresponds to truth is indefinite. In a broad view of the Bible, it is vague. Some minds want to see the relation of the parts to the whole. How does this particular instance relate itself to one in the Bible narrative that has gone before? How does it relate itself to one that follows several hundred pages further on? How is the whole inner meaning of the Word woven into one fabric of exquisite beauty and meaning? Word by word interpretation is valuable; it opens up truth of great beauty; but still it is valuable to a limited degree. Serial spiritual interpretation of the Word as a whole is valuable to a greater degree because it uses the results of the first method of interpretation to make further progress.

We have before us a verse from the book of Amos: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land; not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (viii, 11). Amos is one of the minor prophets. His book stands about two-thirds of the way through the Bible. The verse has meaning of its own in the spiritual sense. We want especially, though, to see the meaning of the verse in its wider application to the whole Word. Spiritual meaning grows out of the Bible narrative, always. So, in order to open the way for coming upon connected spiritual meaning of the Word as a whole, we glance briefly at the Bible narrative as a whole.

Genesis tells of seven days of creation and of life in the Garden of Eden. The description of a devastating flood quickly follows; and a rainbow is the sign of a covenant established between Jehovah and His people.

We read on of Abraham and his descendants: of Ishmael, Hagar's son, spoken of as a "wild ass among men"; of Isaac, Abraham's son, saved from sacrifice in the land of Moriah by the timely intervention of an angel. Joseph especially, Jacob's youngest son, we read of—of his going to Dothan to his brethren, of being sold to Midianite merchantmen, carried to Egypt, imprisoned, interpreting Pharaoh's dream, rising to power second only to Pharaoh's, and of a famine which brings his brethren down to him, all unwittingly, eager to buy corn, and making possible a reconciliation. The children of Israel make Egypt their home.

Joseph dies, and the children of Israel are persecuted. Egyptian taskmasters afflict them. Plagues afflict the Egyptians, and a deliverer for the Israelites is raised up in Moses. Moses leads his people out of Egypt into the desert, toward the land of promise. They are delivered from Egypt. But then begins another time of trial; they receive Ten Commandments at Sinai, and must spend forty years in the rough desert country south of Canaan.

Canaan itself is not given them. It becomes theirs only bit by bit as they subdue its inhabitants. The people tire of their

judges; they long for a king that they may be as the nations round about them. Samuel anoints Saul, the first king of the land. David follows him; and the Bible story is of conflict after conflict as the borders of the land are pushed back, little by little, until war ceases for a time in the reign of Solomon.

But peace is not for long. Prosperity brings decay, and to Solomon first. Kings that follow him are for the most part evil, with some few exceptions. Prophets do their utmost to make the nations conscious of their sins and to open their eyes to the fate that awaits them if reformation is not made. But kings and nobles are heedless; they but hasten the falls of Israel and Judah. Israel goes into captivity to Assyria; Judah goes into captivity to Babylon; they are restored to the land of their fathers, in part, only after the hardship of exile.

The story of the Old Testament leads us to that of the New: to the coming of the Lord visibly to men and to the stories of His life and ministry to the Jews as we have them in the Gospels. But the story still is one of tragedy. The Lord loses His life on the cross. Early Christianity—we know in part from the Epistles and the book of Revelation and more from the history of the times—early Christianity was the hotbed of controversy. Heresy was rife. The simple gospel was all but forgotten—though not lost. Only in the last chapters of the book of Revelation, and that in prophecy, do we come to a peace that is as perfect as it is permanent; to the descent of the Holy City, New Jerusalem; to life on earth in the image of the life of heaven because both are of the Lord. So the story of our Bible runs in simplest outline, from the book of Genesis to the book of Revelation.

The book of Amos has its place in the connected Bible narrative. It comes, chronologically, between the reign of David and the fall of Jerusalem. That is a long period. David came to the throne about 1000 B.C.; Jerusalem fell in 586 B.C.,—a period of over 400 years. Samuel and Saul were active in the years following 1050; and the work of Saul merged into that of David just before the year 1000, as we have said. A little more than 200 years later, the second Jeroboam came to

the throne of Israel. During the later part of his reign, probably, Amos first uttered his prophecy at Bethel, and then later in the seclusion of the desert gave it written form.

Amos foretold the destruction of the kingdom of Israel. Israel was headed for captivity; that was his message. "Jeroboam shall die by the sword, and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of their own land"—so his message ran. His words were fulfilled to the letter. A generation later, Assyria laid siege to Samaria. For three years, Samaria held out; then she fell. Israelites went into captivity and the kingdom of Israel came to an end. That was Israel. Judah held her place among the nations until the fall of Jerusalem, something less than a century and a half later. Amos, then, and his message, came toward the end of the reign of Jeroboam II, two centuries and a half after David came to the throne of Israel; thirty years before Samaria fell and the northern kingdom went into Assyrian exile; and over a century and a half before Jerusalem fell. We have no earlier writing from the hand of a prophet than the book of Amos, written about 750 B.C.

The sequence of event in the whole Bible story may be difficult to remember unless it is divided into sections. At the same time, these sections of the Bible story, in their spiritual sense, tell of as many periods in the development of the spiritual life of an individual, from earliest life to death. A section of the Bible story describes a period of spiritual life; the whole story describes the whole life. Divide the Bible narrative into sections, then, and it serves to fix the story in mind as, at the same time, it gives a basis for spiritual interpretation.

Very little has been done in this large way in the New Church, with one notable exception. The substance of our thought on the serial spiritual sense of the Word, descriptive of the spiritual life of an individual, is largely from that one contribution. (See John Worcester's "The Bread of Life," Chapter 18.)

Divide the Bible story as we have it, then, into seven sections. The earlier stories of creation, in Genesis, reach a climax in the perfection of the seventh day when God rested from all the work which He had created and made. The

earth, we remember, "was without form and void—darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light." This is the first period. It tells of the earliest beginnings of life in the individual, before birth; it tells of life, perfect in its unconscious openness to heaven; and then of a dawning consciousness—all this the first period, before birth and up to it.

But openness such as this cannot last. A flood of waters all but blotted out the spiritual life of the race. Only a remnant was saved: Noah and his family were rescued and the second period comes to a climax, and to its own perfection, when a rainbow in the cloud is the visible sign of a lasting covenant with Jehovah—"the water shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh." The openness to heaven of the first period cannot last; we do not want it to last in its extreme simplicity. There is no stamina in an innocence that is ignorant of evil. The child is born. A flood of waters sweeps over the open consciousness of its soul toward heaven. The story tells of the multitude of sense impressions that flood the consciousness, at birth or soon after. Then for three or four years, the waters of a new experience flood the mind of the child and dim the consciousness of heaven that had before been so open.

Soon after, there comes a period of instruction. This is the third period. The child picks up scattered bits of information on all sorts of topics, does it with little thought of their ultimate usefulness to him. He does this, especially, between the ages of five and twelve. Abraham, we remember, had no fixed home at first in Canaan—only a camping ground—as the child has no fixed theory of life. The child is just gathering scattered facts about life and the world in which he finds himself, gathering them into his memory as Joseph gathered corn into the garners of Egypt to prepare for the years of famine ahead.

The child, thus far, has learned much; but the time comes for him to put his knowledge to the test. He must use what he has learned. He must learn to obey; and to obey not only his parents and teachers, as external restraints, but the inner

dictates of his own conscience. The children of Israel left Egypt, went on to Sinai to learn of Ten Commandments, and then dwelt for many years in the desert with the Code and the Ark before they could come at last even to the gateway of the Promised Land. The hardship of their desert life, as they became obedient to Divine law, pictures for us the trials of childhood as it learns to obey the dictates of its conscience. The period of obedience is the fourth period.

But conflicts have hardly begun. The children of Israel were not welcomed to the Promised Land. They did not possess themselves of it without a struggle. That was the work of Saul, David and Solomon, especially, as successive kings. Kings—notice! The people raised the demand: "A king to reign over us that we also may be like all the nations." Such a period comes in life during youth and early maturity. It is a period of conflict, of debate. We love to argue. The reason for each act, for each article of belief, must be made evident. "Reason" in its varying degrees—Saul, David, Solomon—has possession of us. It is the period, too, of hero-worship. We long for a king to reign over us, just as the people begged Samuel to give them a king—Saul—to reign over them. The idolized presence of some great man fills the mind. He is the idol, the ideal, of youth. The fifth period covers the hero-worship and conflicts of youth and early maturity.

Such natural ideals must give place, in time, to more perfect, spiritual ideals. Solomon's prosperity was not sound; it did not last. Decay led to captivities in Assyria and Babylon, and only after grievous exile did restoration follow and the Lord come visibly to the needs of men. And in the same way, any sincere ideals are good; but to progress spiritually, natural ideals have to become spiritual ideals. They must become more perfect. They are growing in a poor soil; they are besieged by a natural selfishness that is proud and arrogant. It loves its own comfort and pleasure. Pride goeth before a fall, and the prophets speak to warn of this danger to the spiritual life as they warned the kings of old. Spiritual disaster, they say, awaits us if a change and improvement are not made. We are riding to a spiritual fall if we do not turn to the Lord;

if the proud and arrogant selfishness is not humbled before the Lord. But we pay no heed to the prophets of the soul and to their warnings as the kings of Judah and Israel paid no heed to theirs. Severe spiritual conflicts and humiliations follow; they hold us captive in a profound discouragement and melancholy. We see life with new eyes. Earthly success and wealth, perhaps, we have in abundance. But what is the use of it all if one lose his own soul? That thought tears us. Only then, captive to a profound discouragement and melancholy, can humility and self-surrender restore us to a normal, healthy, happy state of mind. Only then can the presence of the Lord become more real than it has ever been before. The sixth period is the period of manhood's self-confidence in worldly success issuing in spiritual captivity and ending in spiritual renewal.

Natural ideals lead to conflicts of the spirit. They are purified in the conflict; they are made spiritual; and these, in turn, lead at last to the serene peace of old age. That is the goal. We come upon the goal in the seventh period. It is true, if you turn to the Bible, you read of the Lord's conflicts; you read of doctrinal disputes in the early Christian church; and in other books you read of dispute after dispute all through the history of Christianity, and you say: this is not the peace of old age. That is true. But even after spiritual captivity, after restoration in large part has been made to a serene outlook upon life, still a little more purification of the spiritual ideals must follow in the light of past struggles. Then you turn to the book of Revelation and you read the promise of John's vision of the Holy City, New Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God. The spiritual captivity of manhood, further purified in the later years of life, issues at last in the peace, serenity and faith, in the ripe perfection, of old age in its constant dependence for life upon the Lord. This is not the innocence of childhood that knows no evil; that is the innocence of ignorance. This is the innocence of old age that understands the fact and nature of evil, but finds safety always in the Lord's protection. This is the innocence of wisdom.

Briefly, we have told the Bible story, and traced its descrip-

tion of the growth of the human spirit. Its message is to the individual spiritual life. Creation—and pre-natal openness to heaven; the flood of waters—and the flood of sense impressions soon after birth; Egypt—and childhood's instruction; the Commandments at Sinai—and youthful obedience; Saul, David, Solomon—the natural ideals of early maturity; captivities, the coming of the Lord—the spiritual ideals of adult life; the descent of the Holy City following the conflicts of the early Christian church—and the peaceful perfection of old age: these are seven periods in the growth of the individual spiritual life that stand out most clearly, and the seven sections of the Bible narrative from which each springs.

We single out the sixth section for special emphasis. In the story, it is a period of national decline ending in Assyrian and Babylonian captivity. It deals with the prophets. And we single out Amos from among the prophets,—Amos and his message.

Amos is one of the most fascinating figures of the Old Testament. Bethlehem lies six miles south of Jerusalem. Go six miles further south and you come to Tekoa. Amos lived in Tekoa. It was a little village in the hills, in rough, desert country. The land slopes eastward to the Dead Sea. Flocks were pastured on the heights. Down in the valleys, in the days of Amos, were groves of sycamore trees.

Amos was busy with both. He was a herdsman and he was a gatherer, so he says, of sycamore fruit. He was a farmer. His life was not easy; he knew few comforts. He was used to privation, danger and toil. His sight was keen. It had to be, to detect lurking danger to his flocks. His life was a life to develop keen observation, physical strength, and endurance His character was the product of a frugal existence. Toil without luxury gave Amos a sturdy independence. He watched his flocks in the desert, day after day; he watched and he meditated on the deepest things of life. Quiet meditation gave him a remarkable discrimination. It gave him a supreme contempt for luxury that made men soft and women degenerate. It made clear to him the eternal values in life. Amos was a sturdy son of the desert, physically and morally.

But Amos was not provincial. His knowledge of the world was wide, for his day. Read his book. Watch the quality of his illustration. The River of Egypt; its annual overflow: the history of Philistia; Moab; Assyria: watch him marshal them all to illustrate his thought.

Amos went to market, occasionally, went up to Bethel to sell the wool from his sheep and fruit from his trees. On the journey, he met traders and travelers from foreign lands. He talked with them. At Bethel he met many others. He talked with them. He learned much. He had few books, probably none; but he had a varied and a rich experience. He knew men and nations at first hand. And the experience was not superficial; his judgments were not hasty. It was wide experience, and its meaning deepened and confirmed by solitary meditation in the desert.

And so one day, Amos, the shepherd and farmer, went up to Bethel to market his produce. His observation was keen, as keen as in the desert. He saw life—life exactly opposite to his own frugal, sturdy existence. Jeroboam II, the king, had made great additions to the wealth of his predecessor: Amos saw it all. Nobles were reckless prodigals: Amos saw that. Entertainment was on a lavish scale: Amos saw that, too. Hear what one writer says:

> [The nobles] had their winter houses and their summer houses: they had houses built solidly of hewn stone and panelled with ivory; they had couches inlaid with the same costly material, upon which they reclined annointed with rich perfumes, feasting upon delicacies, drinking wine "in bowls," and listening to strains of varied music:—"revelry" was often to be heard.

Amos saw and heard all these things. These need not have been disgraceful. Many men, today—good men and respected—have both a winter home and a summer home. They take delight in entertaining their friends. They delight in music. Not so disgraceful to use wealth in these ways, in those old days, if come by honestly. But—

> In the capital . . . . might ruled over right, and the palaces of the nobles were stored with the gains of violence and robbery; . . . . justice, so-called, was simple injustice; the claims of innocence were lis-

tened to with impatience. . . . . The nobles of Samaria, immersed in their own pleasures, were selfishly indifferent to the welfare of the nation . . . . they were satisfied with the external semblance of strength and soundness which it presented; they had no eye for the inner flaws which the prophet's keener vision too truly perceived; and they were heedless of the future.

Amos saw it all. He left his frugal existence in the desert and went up to Bethel to sell his produce. There he saw the luxury, the greed, the avariciousness of nobles and merchants. He saw the hardship, the unjust treatment, of the peasant. The sight set him thinking. He returned to his flocks and his trees in the country, and he thought it all over in the quiet of his seclusion. Once more he went to Bethel. Again he saw the nobles' abuse of wealth and power. Again he saw the injustice; he saw it was leading Israel to destruction. Again he returned to the desert and pondered. The sense of impending danger oppressed him. Indignation at Israel's folly flamed within him. Finally, on one visit to the city, he could contain himself no longer. He spoke out in his indignation:

> Thus saith the Lord, For three transgressions of Israel and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they sold the righteous for silver, and the poor for a pair of shoes.

And (on another visit) this was to be the punishment:

> Thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword,
> And thy land shall be divided by line;
> And thou thyself [Jeroboam] shall die in a land that is unclean,
> And Israel shall surely go into exile away from his land.

The picture was a dark one. Amos was a "prophet of doom"; his message was a message of gloom.

Try to leave the Niagara River five miles from the brink of the Falls, and you can. Try to leave it five feet from the brink, and no effort of your own can possibly save you from the plunge. So with Israel. National corruption, and personal, were bearing the nation on to its fall. Decay spread; the decline grew faster. The people might pull themselves to safety; they might arrest national decay and avert national catastrophe, if they began in time—now. If they waited, continued in their evil—if they did that, captivity was certain.

We know how, in a moment of danger, the past life flashes through the mind. Death seems near. One sees the good he has done; one sees the evil. They stand in sharp contrast, marked clear before the mind's eye. Eternal values seem never to have been so clear—or so desirable—before.

So with Israel. In the day of national disaster and confusion, exile imminent, the vision of the people will clear. They will see their need. Eternal values will come clear in a moment. They will see them then as Amos sees them now. What use the wealth, wrung from peasants' toil? What satisfaction in lavish entertainment bought with human lives, marked with violence and immorality? Regret for past evil! National ruin, and personal ruin, inevitable! The future hopeless! All this seen in a moment of danger, clearer than ever before. "Behold, the days come"—and this, mark you, on the very brink of national disaster—

> Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord. And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it.

The word of the Lord desired more than ever before, but too late. Could other words express more vividly the despair of it all? And remember, Amos' observation was keen; his judgment true; Amos saw straight. Thirty years later, his words were fulfilled to the letter. Samaria fell, and Israel went into Assyrian captivity.

History runs in cycles. The spiritual life ebbs and flows. The spiritual life of the Most Ancient Church rose to its highest perfection, fell away; it was nearly lost. The Ancient Church took its start from the decline of the Most Ancient, rose to a perfection of its own and in its turn ebbed away. And so it goes. So in less general terms. A period of great religious fervor succeeds a period of indifference to religion, and then itself lapses into indifference.

Conditions in Swedenborg's day, for instance: a formal church, faith without charity (if, indeed, there was any faith), a degraded, immoral people, darkness in every department of

life. But the darkness did not last forever. Light broke, the light of a new day. Swedenborg did his work of revelation. Wesley did much to revive the spiritual life of England. Across the sea, in America (a premonition of the new light), religious revivals swept the country. Read of Jonathan Edwards and tales of religious fervor in New England about 1735 he relates! Yet here again the religious fervor, no less than the religious coldness of Swedenborg's day, did not last. It subsided, to ebb and flow, once and again, during succeeding centuries.

Today, there is a profound indifference to church worship. It would be folly to say that subconsciously the religious attitude does not exist. It does. But the social is demanded with the religious, or the religious is promptly forsaken. The danger is that religion that is subconscious may become unconscious, and stay so.

Remember, there was immense wealth in the days of Amos; there was luxury; there were entertainments, lavish entertainments; and there was dire poverty just outside the gates—just like today. Remember, prosperity in the days of Amos dimmed the enduring values of life: the demand was for pleasure—just like today. Prosperity in the days of Amos followed war—just as ours does. Prosperity in the days of Amos preceded exile by a few short years. Does our prosperity precede war? Newspaper reports are not encouraging. Are we going blithely on, blindly on, busy with the pursuit of pleasure, oblivious to the enduring values in life, on to another and a more terrible war?

The community as a whole, today, is profoundly indifferent to the church as an organization. But sudden danger brings insight. The scales fall from the eyes. Sudden danger reveals the past as a flash of lightning does the sky at night; it reveals the things worth while. The day will come—and may it not be forced upon us by some dire calamity, as it was in the days of Amos—the day will come when there will be a famine in the land: a famine not of bread, nor a thirst for

water, but a famine, in sudden and perhaps unavailing repentance, a famine of hearing the word of the Lord.

The community tends to captivity to its pleasures. But turn to the individual. I imagine there are few experiences of the soul more trying than to long with all the heart and mind for states of trust in the Lord that we remember but seem to have lost: hours of peace in the assurance of His presence, in conviction of His goodness. I imagine there are few experiences more trying than to want the Lord, and to feel Him far away.

Here is a man in adult life, any normal man. He has been successful in business. He is well-to-do, perhaps wealthy. He holds a position of honor in the community; but he has given little thought to the Lord and heaven. Then, one day, he begins to think. Years are passing. The thought of death and what lies beyond become more real. Then comes the further thought: what is the use of wealth, of honor? Death is coming; wealth then is of no avail. Fear shadows his life. The famine of his soul breaks into his consciousness.

Interpreting the prophets, Swedenborg uses again and again the word, vastation: utter searching, condemning, laying waste the evil of life. The period of vastation comes as certainly in the adult life of men and women who are regenerating as captivity came upon Israel and Judah.

The thirst of the soul for water—the longing of the soul for knowledge of the Lord's salvation. There are material possessions enough; but the lack of heavenly knowledge humiliates us. We long for it and it is withheld. The famine of the soul for bread—the longing of the soul for the assurance that charity has brought the Lord's approval. There is wealth enough, but the lack of charity through life so far humiliates us. Fellowship with the Lord seems so remote from all experience. We long for knowledge about Him, and for the desire to serve the neighbor. The longing—the thirst, the hunger—we seem unable to appease. And for this reason: ideals have been natural. They have been growing in a poor soil. Now they are besieged by a natural selfishness that is proud and arrogant. It loves its own comfort and pleasure. That longing is the famine of the soul that comes in adult life.

It comes in the full tide of worldly success. It is the famine that accompanies the spiritual captivity of the soul.

As Amos says, we "go tottering from sea to sea, and from the north to the east; we run to and fro," searching the past, the present—seeking, seeking the word of the Lord, some comforting assurance—and we do not find it. What is success; what is power; what is position, if in the end we lose the soul? What is any one of these things worth without a knowledge of the saving power of the Lord and the conviction of His Fatherly presence? These thoughts mark spiritual captivity. They reveal the famine of the soul.

But see what is happening. Here are evil thoughts and desires; they come from evil spirits, from hell. Here are good thoughts and desires; they come from good angels, from heaven. The evil spirits do their utmost to drag us down to ways of sinning. The angels do their best to keep us from sinning. We are in freedom to choose our course. But we have to decide and spiritual conflict results from the effort to decide. We are captive, spiritually, for the time. We long for peace and we cannot have it; for only then, captive to a profound discouragement and melancholy, can humility and self-surrender restore us to a normal, healthy, happy state of mind. Only then can the presence of the Lord become more real than it has ever been before. The purpose of captivity is to bring the external life into subjection to the internal. "This combat takes place to the end that the external man may be reduced to obedience to the internal." Manhood's self-confidence in worldly success (the sixth period considered above) issues in spiritual captivity, and ends in spiritual renewal.

Famine and thirst, then, mark spiritual captivity. Spiritual captivity is one temptation of adult life; it is permitted to help men and women regenerate. Temptation overcome makes the Lord's presence real and leads to heaven.

Amos was a "prophet of doom." But years after he wrote, when the exiled were returning to rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple, the golden light of retrospect began to play over the darkness of the past. The darkness of captivity and of exile were passing. Men wanted encouragement to spur them on in

the task of reconstruction. They thought Amos too severe, and some writer touched his work with a ray of hope:

> Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities . . . . and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God.

This writer made the book of Amos, the "dark book of Judgment, end in a golden vision of hope and light."

Daylight follows the darkest night. The captives suffered in Assyria and Babylon, but restoration was made to the homeland. The Lord was tempted many days in the wilderness, but the devil left him, and angels came and ministered unto Him. Darkness covered all the land at His death, but morning broke at last; it brought a wild and trembling hope to His friends.

So with us as we battle in the spiritual captivity of the soul. Some consolation, some hope, lie in the very fact of temptation to brighten the darkest struggle. We know the Lord is with us, more then than at any other time. He is fighting for us. That helps. And the promise of final salvation cheers us on, out of the darkest spiritual captivity of adult life, into the peace of old age, on to the heavenly home. "I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you."

HORACE W. BRIGGS.

CURRENT LITERATURE

HELEN KELLER'S "MY RELIGION"*

The account that Miss Keller gives in "My Religion" of what she has found in the teaching of Swedenborg, revealing what Christianity can be, is emphatically an appraisal from the heart. There is as careful and keen statement as the close student could desire. There is competent estimate of the teaching of Swedenborg. But it is Helen Keller's affection for what she has found in Swedenborg, and by way of him, which has written this readable and often eloquent book.

An affectionate interest in Helen Keller on the part of a Mr. Hitz of Washington, D. C., led to her first interest in Swedenborg when she was thirteen. Mr. Hitz (of whom there is an interesting picture in the book) would rise some hours before his own work needed him, and do into Braille for her pages of "Heaven and Hell" and other books. From then on her interest grew; and the assimilation of one inspiring truth after another went on, until she came to her present matured and individual grasp of some of the living significance of the Seer.

While Miss Keller pours her heart out over what has meant so much to her, she not only sketches with skill one teaching and another, but she insists, as rightly as she does quietly, that hers was an unusual access to Swedenborg's meaning about an unseen world.

Naturally she has found very appealing, and also widely verified in her own exceptional experience, the reality of the world of the spirit, its nearness, its humanness, and its inspiration, and offer of the goal of life.

* *My Religion.* By Helen Keller. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. 1927. 208 pp., 12mo. $2.00.

No one seemed able or willing to follow his (Swedenborg's) giant strides into the upper realm of speculation. He was an eye among the blind, an ear among the deaf, a voice crying in the wilderness with a language they could not understand. Possibly my own partial isolation from the world of light and sound gives me this keen sense of his peculiar situation. (P. 17.)

As I wander through the dark, encountering difficulties, I am aware of encouraging voices that murmur from the spirit realm. I sense a holy passion pouring down from the springs of Infinity. I thrill to music that beats with the pulses of God. Bound to suns and planets by invisible cords, I feel the flame of eternity in my soul. Here, in the midst of the every-day air, I sense the rush of ethereal rains. I am conscious of the splendor that binds all things of earth to all things of heaven—immured by silence and darkness, I possess the light which shall give me vision a thousandfold when death sets me free. (Pp. 27, 28).

Not the first word to her that God is Love, but the assurance that the idea can live theologically, in the thick of the most rigid thought, came to her by way of Swedenborg's teaching. She had been alive to an all-embracing love in life. She had trusted to it. It would have been what she called God, except that that word seemed to be used by others of a Being in Whom she recognized none of this love. Even the Old Testament sounded confused on this. The clear enough note of the New Testament was muffled in presumably Christian but loveless dogmas. Swedenborg's systematic description of the Divine as Love itself established the idea theologically. Here was a Love that craved others than itself on which to spend itself, with whom It might be one, and whom It might bless to eternity out of its own riches. This systematic picture of Swedenborg's, ample, the more possible for seeing God in Christ as yet He had not been seen, and borne out by his spiritual world experience, this wedded intuition and conviction, prescience and grasp firmly together for Miss Keller.

Other teachings had their appeal. I doubt whether any one has commented with more penetration on Swedenborg's insistence that delight is bound up deeply with life and growth. There are good reproductions of his contributions on Scripture problems, a kind of instantaneous recognition of the deeper

sense of Scripture, some fine assessments of Swedenborg's doctrine of life's religious development.

The book will be the means of bringing to others the treasures of Word and Master which Swedenborg serves to lay open. Such an account from the heart of his teachings is a net cast on the right side of the ship, if ever there was one in available literature. It will galvanize the interest, as it will instruct the appreciation, of all of us who have taken up the Seer's teaching.

The book is attractively made by the publishers; it includes two illustrations, one of them a less familiar and very appealing photograph of Miss Keller; and it is modestly priced.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

"THE MODERN RELIGIOUS SITUATION"*

We have before us a volume of lectures originally delivered at the "Summer School of Theology" annually held at Parkin College, Adelaide, Australia. They were heard with great interest, not only by students for the Christian Ministry, but also by ordained ministers and lay people. They discuss frankly the difficulties of the modern religious situation, and they are of interest to the New-Churchman as a confession of failure of the Christianity of the past to meet the religious needs of the present. They set forth both sides—indeed, all sides—of present-day discussion, presenting the conflicting views of various schools of thought in a clear manner, and giving the author's own views at intervals, which for the most part are marked with good sense, but seldom reach far into the realm of spiritual things. He very modestly remarks at the outset that

> No one individual can do more than offer a very modest contribution to the total result, and many difficult problems may have to wait for solution pending the advent of fuller knowledge and new revelations of the ever-working Spirit of God. At the same time, I would strongly

---

*_The Modern Religious Situation._ By the Rev. Edward S. Kiek, M. A. (Oxon.), B. D. (Lond.). Principal of Parkin College, Adelaide. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926. 216 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.75.

insist on the urgent need for hard thinking and fearless speaking. The idea is widespread that Christianity is intellectually discredited and even bankrupt. I believe this idea to be entirely erroneous, so far as concerns the real Gospel of Jesus Christ, but it is not altogether erroneous so far as certain *presentations* of the Gospel are concerned. (P. 4.)

He proceeds to discuss difficulties about the Fatherhood of God, Prayer, Christian Ethics, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, the Atonement, the Future Life, the Church, and the Ministry. The modern difficulty about the Fatherhood of God is the problem of evil. "It is not the *Being* of God but the *Character* of God which constitutes the crux of the problem." "Jesus made the Holy Love of God central in His theology." Yet cruelty and suffering go on. Suffering is educative, men are made perfect through suffering. "We believe that this life is but part of a vaster scheme." "I believe in God the Father Almighty."

Prayer in an age of science becomes a very different thing from primitive prayer. But the laws of science are not of any explanatory value. "All attempts to represent mind as a mode or by-product of matter have ended in disaster: it seems much more likely that matter is a mode of mind." If human personality is a real factor on the material plane and on the spiritual, may we not conclude that personalities subhuman and superhuman may have a part in the scheme of things? It is all a matter of evidence. "Scientifically my intervention in the universe is just as much a mystery as any intervention on the part of God." But the purpose of prayer is not to get our way, but to get God's way. "Not my will but Thine be done."

The Virgin Birth is discussed very fully with its *pros* and *cons*. The evidence leaves it an open question. It is here that we realize the world's need of the revelation of the Second Coming, more perhaps than anywhere else.

But with the resurrection of the Lord our author has no uncertain note to utter. He is certain that the Lord rose on the third day and left the tomb empty; but how and with what body He rose, there is the difficulty.

All through the book we enjoy the clear and cogent reasoning on the material plane, but we wonder that nothing more

spiritual is reached. It is a fair sample of the best that is being given in the world about us, outside of the New Church. How great is the darkness in comparison with the revelation of light found in the writings of the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ in His Second Coming!

H. Clinton Hay.

THE VISIONS OF SADHU SUNDAR SINGH.*

In the little book before us Sadhu Sundar Singh, a Hindu Christian, tells of various visions seen by him during the past fourteen years. They come to him usually when he is praying or meditating. He cannot call them up at will. They appear as often as eight or ten times a month. He says of them:

> I see clearly every detail of the glory of the spiritual world, and I have the uplifting experience of very real fellowship with the saints, amid the inconceivably bright and beautiful surroundings of a spiritual world made visible. It is from these angels and saints that I have received, not vague, broken and elusive messages from the unseen, but clear and rational elucidations of many of the problems that have troubled me. (P. xii.)

Several of his teachings are strikingly like those of Swedenborg; but others are not in harmony with the latter. For instance, he makes a distinction between God and Christ. While he says that Christ is the manifestation of God, he does not make clear that Christ is God Himself in a Divine Human form as manifested in the world. According to this author, Christ is a distinct person who meets all new-comers into the spiritual world. He dwells in the highest heaven on a throne. Marvelous light flows from Him. One author says, "There is no God here except the true God, and Christ who is His manifestation."

Of the conditions in the spiritual world, he says, heaven is a place of indescribable glory,—beautiful gardens, birds, man-

**Visions of the Spiritual World,* A Brief Description of the Spiritual Life, Its Different States of Existence, and the Destiny of Good and Evil Men as Seen in Visions. By Sadhu Sundar Singh. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. 84 pp., 12mo. $1.00.

sions, a wonderful paradise. The world of spirits is intermediate between heaven and hell, a preparatory stage. Hell is the abode of the evil, a place of darkness. The new comers cannot deceive, nor can they conceal their evil. They are astonished that their thoughts and purposes are known even before than manifest them. When one wishes to go to another place he is immediately there. Inhabitants from other planets are spoken of.

All this seems very close to Swedenborg; but let us note other disagreements. For instance, he teaches that spirits and angels see what men in the world are doing. This does not agree with Swedenborg, who very definitely teaches that the two worlds are distinct as to consciousness. Neither is consciously present to the other, and this for very wise reasons.

Another difference, he tells of one who was given permission by God to enter heaven, but was repelled at the first threshold. But Swedenborg teaches that when novitiate spirits desire to see heaven, they are prepared and admitted for purposes of instruction.

Is it possible that Sadhu Sundar Singh has been reading Swedenborg, and then has had visions which reflected the ideas derived from Swedenborg? Or did he really receive direct information from heaven? The close resemblance of his ideas to those taught in Swedenborg, the divisions of the spiritual world, expressed in the same terms, seem as though he had first gained his information from Swedenborg, and then the spirits had confirmed him in it.

It would be interesting to know more of this case, including the previous knowledge which Sadhu Sundar Singh had, and especially whether he had previously read Swedenborg. In the case of several others whose visions are on record, it has been proved that many facts derived from Swedenborg were the source of their visions.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

"THE CHRIST OF THE INDIAN ROAD."*

"The Christ of the Indian Road," by E. Stanley Jones, is a personal testimony to the power and influence of the Christ which should be most helpful to all who believe the Gospel that "THE LORD GOD JESUS CHRIST REIGNS, whose kingdom shall be for ages and ages." Here we have the word of a missionary to India who worked faithfully and arduously for eight or nine years in the traditional spirit of thinking that the religion of the natives of India must be completely displaced by Christianity. His work was among the outcasts mostly. The outcome of his efforts was his almost complete breakdown nervously. He came back to this country in the attempt to regain his shattered health. Returning to India he found that he was still unable to carry on.

Then he had a wonderful psychic experience, in which he heard a Voice questioning his ability to carry on the work which the Voice wished him to do. He acknowledged his weakness; and the Voice suggested that he drop his worry, and trust the outcome to the Voice. At once he entered into the covenant, and immediately had the experience of "abundant life." He had wonderful strength to carry on. But he no longer felt the necessity of displacing the religions of his hearers with Christianity, but rather of adding Christ to the foundation of their religious belief. The results were remarkable, and he was able to get a hearing from high caste Hindus,—an accomplishment rarely realized by the ordinary missionary.

He tells of meeting Mahatma Ghandi, and of the comparison of Ghandi to Christ as the highest expression of esteem. Many of the astute thinkers of India acknowledged openly that what they need is Christ. Jones feels that the approach to Christ is the approach to God, and that God is Christlike. His view of the Bible is that it is the work of Christ. His devotion to Christ, and his experience of power in this devotion, is most significant. It is a striking confirmation of the

*_The Christ of the Indian Road._ By E. STANLEY JONES. New York: The Abingdon Press. 213 pp., 16mo. $1.00.

fact of the Second Coming, with all that that implies. No longer trammeled by the hindrances of historical and ecclesiastical Christianity, he concentrates on the central thought of Christ, and trusts to Christ to aid him in his efforts to spread the Gospel. He seems very much like the disciples whom the Lord sent out into the spiritual world on the nineteenth of June, 1770.

The perusal of the book gives us renewed courage. The simplicity of the author shines out from its pages, and indicates how we may place ourselves in the stream of Divine Providence. No complicated philosophy seems necessary. The powerful thought of Christ is all that seems to count.

An interesting sidelight on this book is thrown by Mr. A. Boo and Mr. Nai Di in their report to the General Convention of the New Jerusalem:

> Though we were not privileged by occasional visits of New-Church ministers to hear their teachings and lecturing, we had the pleasure of hearing a series of lectures delivered by a man named Dr. Stanley Jones of America, who was invited by the Christian Council of Burma, Rangood. He is an eloquent lecturer and preacher. None of us knows to what church he belongs. Paper says, "Few know to what church he belongs. He flits across India from one corner to another, and has written a book entitled 'Christ of the Indian Road.' He is a great believer in Jesus and nothing else." His lectures delivered here in Moulmein helped us a great deal in our work, as we find every one of his lectures based on the teachings of the New Jerusalem. We could judge from them that he was more or less a New-Churchman than a man of any other denomination of Christianity.

We recommend this book to the most careful and repeated reading for the inspiration and courage which it gives.

JOHN DABOLL.

PUBLIC LECTURES AT HARVARD*

We have before us three volumes of extra-curricular lectures on religious subjects delivered at Harvard University of recent years and published in book form within the past few months. Two of them consist of single lectures in accordance

*_Religion or God?_ By EDWARD S. DROWN, Professor in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. (The Dudleian Lecture for

with certain foundations, and the third of a series delivered at the Phillips Brooks House in 1924-6, speakers and topics having been chosen by the Graduate Schools Society and the Christian Association of the Phillips Brooks House Association. The subjects of all these addresses are important, and the reputations of all the speakers practically assure the worthwhileness of the treatment, whether originally in the form of set lectures or of informal talks with questions and answers following.

The Dudleian lecturer of 1926, Prof. Edward S. Drown of the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, chose as his subject the fundamental one of natural religion, concerning the knowledge of God apart from revelation (in its usual significance). The various arguments for the existence of God are alluded to, and in contrast with their seeming inconclusiveness the contention of certain modern thinkers that religion is but an objectification of our own ideals—or, as Prof. J. H. Leuba maintains, that it is a state of consciousness to which no outward reality corresponds—is presented by way of stressing the alternative question of the lecture, "God or Religion?" The assumption that religion has no theistic foundation that is actual, is wholly unacceptable to our author, who affirms the equality of the two infinitives in the old metaphysical formula *esse est percipi*, and then argues as it were from the formula *percipi est esse* to the practical certainty (1) of the actuality of the outer world and (2) of the living personalities within the human bodies that are part of that outer world. These conclusions are obviously based on psychological facts of experience. In like manner he affirms that some persons claim to have consciousness of the actuality of God in the universe; and he maintains that, though rare, there is enough of such testimony to give it credence. In criticism of

1926.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. 26 pp., 8vo. Boards, $1.00.

Spiritual Values and Eternal Life. By HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK. (The Ingersoll Lecture for 1927.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1927. 40 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.00.

Religion and Modern Life; [A Symposium of Eighteen] Lectures given for the Phillips Brooks House Association, Harvard University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1927. 370 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $2.50.

this position we would remark that, while we believe that the cumulative testimony of sensitive persons as to their consciousness of the actuality of the spiritual world and of spiritual beings in it is overwhelming (which fact alone might be affirmed as giving adequate basis for all "primitive" religions), we think that the inference that in such experiences the finite consciousness is ever aware of the infinite personality is open to serious question.

The Ingersoll Lecture of 1927, on "Spiritual Values and Eternal Life," by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, seems to us an excellent one as regards its line of argument, though in view of its handling as an address to a somewhat popular audience it lacks real depth of treatment. Dealing with the question of immortality on rationalistic grounds, he affirms that for him the actuality of the spiritual values which man experiences and creates compels an affirmative conclusion. The love of truth, the love of goodness, the love of beauty—these characteristics quite peculiar to humanity imply to his mind the certainty of the indefinite continuance of a nature that can so function, and of the actuality of a world in which it can so function eternally. Had he cared to bring in such collateral thoughts, he might have remarked that the most potent arguments for the existence of God and for the nature of God take their rise from the same characteristics of human nature: since intensive analysis of what is implied in man's love of goodness, truth and beauty, leads inevitably to the conception of a worshipful God in whom all those loves culminate. In short, truth, goodness and beauty involve the actuality of a God of worshipful personality, the actuality of a blessed spiritual world, and the actuality of human immortality—this last being the contention of Dr. Fosdick in his worthy lecture.

Turning now to the composite volume of Phillips Brooks House addresses, which were for the special benefit of the students of the University, we find them of very unequal merit, the poorest of the lot being that of the late ex-President of the University, whose subject was "Religion for Modern Youth." The superiority-complex manifests itself quite spon-

taneously in his case; and he throws out his Sadducean leaven in a most pernicious way with his nonchalant

> In regard to past beliefs I suppose—I believe—that the modern youth rejects almost all the tenets, dogmas, and creeds of the past; that he comes to the question of religion with a mind free from the terrible obstacles which the common Christian dogmas and creeds have imposed upon past generations. (P. 8.)

After wiping the slate nearly clean in this way, he practically tells his hearers that the only reasonable and true ideas about religion are those he himself now holds, with such modification as future scientific enlightenment may bring. During his talk he states in so many words that he was born a Unitarian, has always been a Unitarian; and the inference he wishes his hearers to make is obvious. Evidently he hasn't much concern as to actual truth, whatever that may be, but is enamored of his own opinions concerning truth. These he sets forth sufficiently, in part by quotation from his Unitarian tract of nearly twenty years ago entitled "The Religion of the Future".

In contrast with the unsatisfactory nature of Dr. Eliot's talk, we can speak in warm commendation of some of the others. Of course most of the lecturers deal with their subjects in purely rationalistic ways; but there is no harm in that, if the thinking is sound. We have especially enjoyed the lecture on "Christianity and Other Religions" by Prof. Daniel Evans (though in his presentation of Christianity as superior to other religions he gives no ground for other than a Unitarian assumption as to its founder); that on "What Is the Good of Religion?" by Prof. Ralph Barton Perry (a fine bit of careful thinking); and that on the "Religion of the Future," by Prof. Wm. Ernest Hocking (in which he incidentally asserts his own conviction —with which we heartily agree—that the religion of the future will not be Humanism, that modernistic development within the Unitarian movement towards no religion at all). Not that we agree with all that these gentlemen present,—far from it; but they are good thinkers, and stimulate thought.

Others decidedly worth reading are: "Religion and the Mind," by Prof. James Bissell Pratt (in spite of his reiterated

designation of God as the "Determiner of Destiny"): "Sin, Conversion, Forgiveness, and Atonement," by Prof. Angus Dun (in which he deals with these several ideas in a clarifying way); and "Personal Religion," by Bishop Lawrence (largely a personal narrative). Bishop Slattery's handling of the subject "Mysticism and Prayer" is unsatisfactory, as being very ministerial in its flavor, and as wrongfully debasing the mystical element in religion to the commonplace, as though all men were religious and all men had mystical experiences. While we are willing to admit that humanity as a race is incurably religious, we are not willing to admit that characterization when applied to the average individual; much less that the average individual ever has a mystical experience even of a rudimentary sort, or that the psychology of religion based upon the average man's experience is anything but sorry stuff.

But enough! The volume is worth reading as presenting many lines of thought that interest the thinking man of the present day; but in our opinion it nowhere approaches the essence of real religion, unless we admit that Prof. George Herbert Palmer is right in characterizing the contents of ethics and religion as the same (pp. 154 and 162), a conclusion which we think is very faulty. B. A. WHITTEMORE.

A NEW AND EXCELLENT COMMENTARY ON DANIEL*

The New-Churchman feels an especial interest in the book of *Daniel*. It is part of a special interest in any and all of the apocalyptic literature of the Bible. What with its mysteriousness of style, apocalypse seems to be in itself an argument for the likelihood of a deeper meaning in Scripture, such as the New-Churchman believes exists. When Swedenborg, in the "Arcana", reaches the apocalyptic forty-ninth chapter of *Genesis*, he obviously feels that he finds in it more than the usual warrant for his proposition that most of the books of the Bible possess a continuous deeper sense.

There is another reason for the special appeal of apocalypse

**The Book of Daniel.* By JAMES A. MONTGOMERY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1927. xxxi + 478 pp., 8vo. $4.50.

to the New-Churchman. He has for an initial and characteristic conviction of his, that Christianity is entering on a new period of growth and influence. It is being made new by the Lord Who comes again. That essentially is what the New-Churchman's name means. But it is the apocalyptic literature of the Bible which has to do with ages in the race's religious history, and with the Divine advents which inaugurate new eras. To the New-Churchman, therefore, the apocalypses of Old and New Testament, *Daniel* and *Revelation,* seem especially to have to do with the day. The title page of "The True Christian Religion" speaks of the New Church as foretold in *Daniel* and in *Revelation*—in any detail only in the deeper sense of those books, but in a general way in the historical sense, too, because the promises in that sense of a well established kingdom of the Son of man on this earth with all its resultant blessings, no man will assert have had their full and last fulfilment. It might also be added that the only Scripture in the Gospels to which Swedenborg gave detailed and serial exposition, is again an apocalyptic chapter or two, *Matthew* xxiv and xxv.

Having these special interests in apocalypse and in *Daniel,* the New-Churchman might well prize such a comprehensive and able commentary as this in the International Critical Series. It will give him that acquaintance with the book from the bottom up which he very much needs to build on, if he is to put out with strength, and with any command of the confidence of others, the thesis of a deeper meaning. Who will credit him with any knowledge of a deeper meaning, if he is not plainly possessed of a knowledge of the book as it stands and reads, and of its weighty historical messages?

Dr. Montgomery's Commentary follows in general the plan of the series in which it becomes one volume. It gives *Daniel* chapter by chapter in fresh translation; there are succinct summaries of the chapters; comment on meaning is done in larger type; critical notes, with a wealth of information, follow in smaller type. This main portion, or the actual commentary, occupies 366 pages out of the total of 478.

Preceding the actual commentary is a large and interesting

introduction dealing with all the more general questions which are bound to come up in any reflective study of the book: the why of the two languages, Hebrew and Aramaic (a question as inexplicable as ever); the date of writing; the relative value of different versions for helpfulness with the Hebrew and Aramaic original; the nature and dependability of the historical data involved in the prophecy; the extant literature on the book.

We can speak only of some general features of the work. We have looked the Introduction through, and in the commentary proper read closely on Chapter viii of *Daniel*—a chapter that belongs in the more cryptic section of the book, and which is key to the most cryptic chapter of all, vii. Chapter viii also contains the most difficult single brief passage in *Daniel*, from a textual standpoint,—verses 11 and 12.

Dr. Montgomery's writing is concise. He gives large attention to Aramaic studies, fresh finds not yet utilized in an English commentary on Daniel. There is much fresh and suggestive textual study. In historical criticism Dr. Montgomery departs from a reigning view that all the book is of Maccabaean date, and credits the earlier chapters to somewhat earlier days. He notes when and with whom the better known interpretations of this or that passage of the book sprang up. There is, for instance, the ancient query at chapter viii whether Daniel was in Susa actually or in vision. The New-Churchman would be especially interested to note that as early as the Syriac version, the interpretation was that Daniel was in Susa in vision. The scholar also reads this not as a rhetorical device, but as a psychological experience. We were struck, too, in chapter viii, by the large and helpful citations of Semitic, Persian, and Hellenic culture in illumination of *Daniel*. The constant recording of the readings at any point of the chief current English versions—the Authorised, the Revised English, the Revised American Standard, and the new Jewish—is another great convenience.

The student of the book of *Daniel* will want certain general studies in addition, but for a commentary he could (with practically no loss of other views) devote himself to this very scholarly production.

WM. F. WUNSCH.

"THE CITY OF PERFECTION"*

Mr. Masson was editor of *Life* for twenty-eight years. He is an editor of the *Saturday Evening Post,* and has been associated as an editorial writer with the *New York Times* and the *Herald-Tribune.* "The City of Perfection" is the latest of three books, "That Silver Lining," and "Why I am a Spiritual Vagabond," having preceded it. This one is intended to be a spiritual guide to an invisible city of our real selves in which we all dwell." "It is a call to awake from our material dream of existence to the life of the spirit, which is in truth the great reality." "Its purpose is to unite all denominations . . . Christian, Jew, Mohammedan." It claims to be the echo of the thought of all philosophers, Plato, Kant, Descartes, Spinoza, Schopenhauer, Spencer, and William James. It cites Swedenborg several times, and Mrs. Eddy once. It contains a long bibliography in which Swedenborg is included, first among the mystics, and second among the miscellaneous. It seems quite evident that the author has not grasped Swedenborg's system, for he denies the reality and permanence of the material universe while Swedenborg teaches that it is a universe of appearances, but of *real* appearances; and that it is the foundation, or ultimate reality, upon which the created universe rests and forever reacts. The author of "The City of Perfection" states that God is the unknown; but Swedenborg teaches that He has made Himself knowable in our Lord Jesus Christ; and that the way to spiritual life and spiritual awareness, is in forsaking all that we regard as our own, and in following Him as the "Way, the Truth, and the Life." Indeed, this is the teaching of the Lord Jesus Himself in the Sacred Scriptures. And just here we reach the weakness of the book, namely, that it does not lead men to God—a personal God, in the Lord Jesus Christ. It comes perilously near spiritual pantheism in teaching that God is "Totality," the whole. It is true that Swedenborg teaches that God is all, and that we can be and do nothing of ourselves; and yet he teaches

**The City of Perfection.* By Thomas L. Masson. New York: The Century Co. 1927. 447 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $2.50.

that we must "act *as* of ourselves, acknowledging that the will, the understanding, and the power to do so are of the Lord alone." The fact that God gives us the will, the understanding, and the power to act as of ourselves, is that which distinguishes us from God, and clothes us with spiritual entity and responsibility. This distinction between man and his Maker never appears in this book, and the absence of it is the weakness of the book everywhere. We read:

> Having succeeded by an effort of the soul (the result of meditation and concentration) in placing yourself in this region of pure thought referred to, you must then select a symbol which will serve as a foundation stone. Only one symbol can thus be used; that is one which expresses the whole. Let us take for a symbol the word "Totality." For it is better just now to select a word which has had no previous association with creeds or traditions. This means practically the same as "Creator," or the source of one's being. You develop this image internally, as you like. (Pp. xxvi, xxvii.)
>
> But now, for the moment, let us hold the thought, that anything which is a whole or Totality must be unaware of itself. It is essential to understand this truth as an attribute of our God; therefore meditate on it until the understanding comes. Being absolutely complete, Perfection or Totality cannot possibly be aware of anything outside of itself. There is no such thing. (P. xxviii.)

This must mean that we are not outside of our Creator. The real truth, then, must be that we and our Creator are one and the same. We read on:

> Our progress consists entirely of *increasing* the sense of Totality, while *diminishing* the sense of imperfection on incompleteness. (P. xxviii.)
>
> Our ultimate victory over the world, or, to put it more definitely, our happiness and spiritual well-being, depend entirely upon our power to hold the thought of Perfection, of Totality. When we finally become so that we constantly dwell in the presence of Totality (God) we shall then experience no sorrows. We shall be victims of no accidents. We shall move serene and tranquil in a world of fleeting images. Love, Truth, Wisdom shall be ours. (P. xxix.)

After this we are not surprised to find a chapter on "you are not guilty"; nor to find running all through the book a denial of the reality of sin, of evil, disease, of the material universe.

H. CLINTON HAY.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

¶ A cheap, well illustrated and concise life of Emanuel Swedenborg.
¶ Suitable for the use of all the Societies and Missionary Institutions of the Church.

The MISSIONARY AND TRACT SOCIETY of London begs to announce the republication of the

"LIFE OF SWEDENBORG"

By the late J. Stuart Bogg. Revised by Rev. H. G. Drummond.

5 x 7½ inches; 40 pages and paper cover; 15 illustrations.
Price Threepence, postage extra, (say 10c. postpaid).

Order of NEW-CHURCH PRESS, Ltd.,
1, Bloomsbury Street, London, W. C. 1, England

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
New York, N. Y. Amer. Swedenborg Printing and Pub. Soc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

CLARENCE W. BARRON, *President*,
GEORGE C. WARREN,
JAMES E. YOUNG, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.